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

**Activity: Community characteristics & orientation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Zain Abedin |
| Customer Focus: | Dave and Gina |
| Date: | Sept 23 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. | | | | . OBA gained information from external resources.  Not sure if accreditation team would like it or not  EGAD website  2014 started being effective the accreditation cycle  Last school to be visited on the requirements  Adopting the things they liked, and creating the things that they needed  Areas of complete miss(life long learning). Did not  know how to assess that very well.  Information gathering | | |
| **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? | | | | -Remap the curriculum and ethics and equity. in the classes.  - Profs struggle to see how to teach equity.  - Life long learning cant control that,  after they graduate no control over that.  - Continual improvement(processes in place  and are in followed).  - collecting the data, cataloging the data,  analyzing the data  - Once you get the data, how are you using it  and how are you using it to  improve.  - Next visit in November 2021(Software, Environmental and Industrial). | | |
| **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 assessing the performance of the students in the class(biggest and active group)  Functional surveys for students and Employers. The employers can tell us how they are doing after they graduate and have a job. Surveys for the Alumni that graduated already.  Try to get some data from business and arts. A simple tool for them would be better.  Program chairs are in the committee. Lab instructor representative.  VP of academics.  Associate dean incase the dean cannot go forward.  Programs analyze their own data. ENEV,ENEL, and ENIN share a lot of courses together.  Need better mechanism.  Professors use to offload data to lab instructors. Professors teach 3 undergraduate classes a year. Lab instructors still need to submit data, but gets aggregated with the data with the data from the prof. | | | | | | |
| How spread apart is it in terms of location and time zones? | | | | | | | | | Community does not have large bounds. When surveying Alumni, no idea where they are so the community in that sense can be spread apart globally.  Employers on the other hand are not as spread apart. Can usually track much easier. | | | | | | |
| What language(s) do members speak? | | | | | | | | | English is the main domain for communication. | | | | | | |
| What other cultural or other diversity aspects may affect your technology choices? | | | | | | | | | Language skills from the professors. What is a graduate attribute how to use indicators. Instructors and clarify. Data collaboration(changing data for one persons needs, and thus affecting other people needs). Format limiting. | | | | | | |
| **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 | | | | | | Not public for outside world of the university.  Internal use only. Program chairs themselves and the deans office.  If there is a sublayer, if the professors can see their own data  than that should be fine. Data might come from surveys( or offices as well). Different entry points for different users like the coop coordinator.  Inferiority complex and other union problems because professors if the data is shared openly | | | | |
| How does your community need to interact with other communities? Do you need common tools for sharing and learning with them? | | | | | | | | | | | Not a lot of interaction with other communities. Maybe a tool, but not as robust as what would be used internally.  Sometimes using final course marks as the graduate attribute data points.  Graduate attribute data excel file and example of the quality of the work from 4 bins in the rubric from worse to exceeding expectations on the boundaries. | | | | |
| **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? | | | | | | | | | Using technology to simplify the amount of work they need to do. Faster it is to complete their task. | | | | | | |
| What is their capacity for learning new tools? | | | | | | | | | Their capacity is good for learning new tools. No major concerns for Profs on how to use the tools. | | | | | | |
| What is the range of skills? If their interests and/or skills are diverse, could it cause conflict or distraction? | | | | | | | | | If the tool is simple, it should promote the use of the tool. To make the task being addresses as fast as possible via the tool. | | | | | | |
| How tolerant are members of the adoption of a wide variety of tools? | | | | | | | | | Good, if it is simple | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | Resistance for managing data traditionally through excel files. Cross logins wont be as big of an issue. Incorporate the old data into the new system with a familiar feel to what they would through playing around on software. | | | | | | |
| What are your members’ technology constraints (e.g., bandwidth, operating systems, etc.)? | | | | | | | | | Operating system constraints mainly. Web browser constraints could be an issue some people using Firefox, Internet Explorer, Safari. | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | Online all the time. | | | | | | |
| **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 significant. **0**. | | | | |
| **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 | | | | Continual improvement process. When a prof submits data, they should be able to give comments on it. Whether another end-user might be able to give comments, that is debatable. Prefer face-face orientations for open-ended conversations. Not functional for program chairs. **1** | | | | |
| **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 | | | | Having a training process or interface showing the people the maps where the data is being collected. **4**. | | | | |
| **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 | | | | Read access to the whole program, write access should be restricted to the program chair or in the committee at a higher level.  No open publishing **. 1** | | | | |
| **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 | | | | Somewhere where users can click, when they would need help. Help should be provided internally. Apprenticeship or mentoring can also be considered. **4 or 5.** | | | | |
| **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 | | | | On the classes that are taken across multiple programs information sharing can be useful. One of the graduate attribute data in Fluid Dynamics was horrible. | | | | |
| **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 still allow instructor of course to enter data if they are not a faculty member. Need to consider personalized control for individual participants. | | | | |
| **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 | | | | Programs get to decide what they want, but their is a framework in place to provide some governance and boundary control. Dynamic tool that is flexible in nature that can be changed down the road. 4 or 5 . Tool that is inflexible and will be thrown out in a few years. Democratic governance happening in the form of the OBA Chairs. They're the administrators for the program, and they are making the administrating decisions.  Any changes the map, that have effect on other regions of other peoples map needs some coordination or facilitation between the parties. | | | | |
| **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 is important. The tool developed should be much more functional than the internal implementation currently(multiple profs and lab) instructors submitting excel files. | | | | |
| **Scratchpad (other interesting insights, questions/answers, etc.)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |