Initial Report

Post-ASM Information Management Committee Meeting Survey

Last Modified: 12/14/2012

1. Which parts of the 2012 LTER Information Management Committee Meeting did you attend (please select…

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Morning	0	0%
2	Afternoon	0	0%
3	Both	22	92%
4	Neither	2	8%
	Total	24	100%

1. Which parts of the 2012 LTER Information Management Committee Meeting did you attend (please select…

Statistic	Value
Min Value	3
Max Value	4
Mean	3.08
Variance	0.08
Standard Deviation	0.28
Total Responses	24

2. How would you rate the overall length of this year's IMC meeting?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Too short	13	62%
2	About right	7	33%
3	Too long	0	0%
4	No opinion	1	5%
	Total	21	100%

2. How would you rate the overall length of this year's IMC meeting?

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	1.48
Variance	0.56
Standard Deviation	0.75
Total Responses	21

3. How would you rate the overall organization and effectiveness of this year's IMC meeting?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Excellent	5	25%
2	Very Good	2	10%
3	Good	5	25%
4	Fair	6	30%
5	Poor	2	10%
6	No Opinion	0	0%
	Total	20	100%

3. How would you rate the overall organization and effectiveness of this year's IMC meeting?

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	2.90
Variance	1.88
Standard Deviation	1.37
Total Responses	20

4. How would you rate the agenda and topics covered during this year's IMC meeting?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Excellent	1	5%
2	Very Good	3	15%
3	Good	11	55%
4	Fair	3	15%
5	Poor	2	10%
6	No Opinion	0	0%
	Total	20	100%

4. How would you rate the agenda and topics covered during this year's IMC meeting?

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.10
Variance	0.94
Standard Deviation	0.97
Total Responses	20

5. What part of the meeting did you think was most effective?

Text Response
The vote.
business meeting and working group mini reposts
Setting the direction for the new EML/PASTA report working group as well as discussion of planned product-oriented proposals
The discussion with the NSF representatives was fantastic. It's good to hear from other sites in how they're dealing with various issues.
Discussion with Saran Twombly
I thought the meeting did a good job on information exchange.
That everyone was encouraged to openly discuss their point of view. That topics were discussed in the weeks leading up to the meeting so everyone arrived somewhat informed and aware.
Morning session
I thought the business section of the meeting was most effective.
LTER IM business meeting
The meeting was effective in covering a huge amount of topics which allowed IMs to be brought up to the current status, however there wasn't much time for working groups to get together.
PASTA EML Quality Checker

5. What part of the meeting did you think was most effective?

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	12

6. What part of the meeting needed the most improvement?

Text Response
The meeting needs more organization up front.
some discussions are so general and board, did not focus on details.
All
The one-day meeting did not allow time for break-out group discussions. The agenda timing broke down with a later start than anticipated and longer discussion than planned on future meeting venues.
to short not well organized
It felt like a rambling discussion without much structure. We never made it to many points on the agenda. So, either, the agenda was unreasonably full, or the timing was not enforced very efficiently. My judgement is, the former was the problem. Site data and the NIS, data inventories, dataset quality checks, etc. appear too large of an issue to tackle all at once. We need to identify smaller subsets of issues and tackle those, one at a time. The whole IMC needs to be involved in identifying the issues, otherwise any discussion will always get out of hand quickly. Or the meeting could have been used to identify the these smaller subsets of issues that can be acted upon. And then identify what actions are necessary. Overall, it seemd like a strange mixture of internal IM business and attempts at making some progress on products.
It's been too long; I don't remember. Seems like we got off topic a few times.
Organization of discussions and breakouts
We really needed more in depth time for working groups and whole group discussion.

6. What part of the meeting needed the most improvement?

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	14

7. Pease select any of the following format changes and options you think would make the meeting more e...

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Make the meeting two days	14	67%
2	Put the meeting at the end of the ASM or whatever meetings it is tied to in order to allow working group activities to inform opinions	5	24%
3	Dedicate one or two VTCs prior to the meeting to prepare and discuss meeting topics	16	76%
4	Other format changes or options I will provide	3	14%

7. Pease select any of the following format changes and options you think would make the meeting more e...

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Total Responses	21

8. What other format changes and options would you suggest beyond those listed to make the meeting more...

Text Response
On an ASM year, the meeting need to be practical. Perhaps a meeting that preparer for the ensuing ASM working groups. IM Meetings need to be more forward thinking when discussing IMC ideas. Meetings could be more practical, product oriented. Not just one product.
If we do a 2 day meeting, I'd suggest having an extra day between it and the ASM for a chance to decompress with a hike or other activity.
Dedicated 2 day IM meetings without a larger meeting focus. IMs interested in larger/presentation type meetings should attend those separately. Need more time for LTER IM face time to accomplish/discuss the many LTER network level tasks.

8. What other format changes and options would you suggest beyond those listed to make the meeting more…

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	3

9. In cases where we the IMC meeting is tied to other meetings (e.g. the ASM) what is your opinion of o...

#	Answer	Response	%
1	In Favor	15	75%
2	No Opinion	3	15%
3	Not In Favor	2	10%
	Total	20	100%

9. In cases where we the IMC meeting is tied to other meetings (e.g. the ASM) what is your opinion of o...

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	3
Mean	1.35
Variance	0.45
Standard Deviation	0.67
Total Responses	20

10. Which of the following do you consider to be effective ways for IMC members to interact with the NSF...

#	Answer	Response	%
1	In-person meetings with the full body of the IMC	17	85%
2	VTCs with the full body of the IMC	13	65%
3	Interactions during meetings of the full LTER membership (including plenary and informational sesions hosted at the ASM)	11	55%
4	Informal interactions at LTER-sponsored and other meeting	12	60%
5	Other options	2	10%

10. Which of the following do you consider to be effective ways for IMC members to interact with the NSF...

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Total Responses	20

11. What other options would you consider as effective ways to communicate with the NSF Program Officers...

Text Response
Meet them with reps. of active working groups. Have an agenda (proposals, supplements). Discuss ideas on that particular working group. In general, arrange meetings with fewer persons, as everybody is more intimidating (specially for the officer) -- such meetigns are impractical for real actions.
I think it is crucial for the full body of LTER IMs to be present when discussions occur with NSF program officers. Each LTER site has its own issues/agenda which will not be fairly represented/interpreted if a smaller group of IMs have access to program officers.

11. What other options would you consider as effective ways to communicate with the NSF Program Officers...

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	2

12. Please use the space below to provide additional comments about the 2012 ASM or suggestions you have…

Text Response
The one-day IMC meeting before ASM is problematic in that time is limited and that much of the preparatory effort is directed at ASM workshops. This year very few ideas bubbled up from the IMC members on desired breakout groups for the meeting (not that there was enough time anyway), but this was likely due to commitments to ASM workshops. Given the size of the IMC meeting at ASM it might make sense to schedule a series of presentations or update reports for the afternoon (rather than breakout groups). The business meeting is essential. I think the time with NSF is important, particularly this year when Saran really wanted to attend, and it makes sense to meet in person with NSF at the ASM meeting while the NSF officer is present anyway. Maintaining good relations with NSF is critical for keeping them in tune with our progress and issues. The meeting room logistics were really detrimental this year with the two separate U-shaped tables.
I think some of the working groups organized by IMs at the ASM were very effective. And I enjoyed the fact that several were attended by domain scientists who were contributing and also seemed to gain something. Overall, there were just too many working groups in parallel, I had to make a hard choices many times. I think some guidance/training in what makes and how to run an effective working group would be very good to improve future meetings. And possibly a stronger selection of which working groups to hold at the ASM, i.e. reducing the number somewhat. Both suggestions are more in general, not for IM working groups alone and they are also based on many comments I have heard recently around here.
Good job this year fitting a lot of meeting into relatively little time.
It was really good that we all saw the agenda well ahead of time and had opportunities to discuss the topics prior to the meeting. That made the meeting time more productive.

12. Please use the space below to provide additional comments about the 2012 ASM or suggestions you have...

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	6

13. You have the option of providing your name, LTER Site, and LTER Role, if any. This is not required.

Text Response
John Chamblee, CWT, Site IM
Inigo San Gil, MCM.
Corinna Gries, NTL, IM
John Porter, VCR, IM
IM at MCR
FCE Information Manager
Hap Garritt, PIE

13. You have the option of providing your name, LTER Site, and LTER Role, if any. This is not required.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	7