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Results of the survey following the iDigBio Summit Meeting held Nov. 29 – Dec. 1, 2011 in Gainesville, FL.
Overview

One aim of the survey was to assess whether the Summit achieved the following goals:

- Increase understanding of the TCNs
- Increase understanding of the collaborators
- Determine current needs, opportunities and capabilities related to georeferencing, data management and archival, specimen imaging and post-processing, and label capture and post-processing
- Determine key issues related to enabling the national resource

A second aim was to solicit feedback regarding the planning and organization of the Summit so as to inform future meetings and workshops.

Thirty Summit participants completed part or all of the survey including 11 representatives from the TCNs, 12 from iDigBio, and 7 others including collaborators. Many responded in depth to the open-ended questions. The responses are included verbatim in this report. When appropriate, the responses are broken down by affiliation (eg., iDigbio) or breakout group.

Understanding of the TCNs

Prior to the Summit, more than 30% of participants reported their understanding of the TCNs to be low or very low. Level of understanding did not differ depending on whether one was a member of a TCN, collaborator, or iDigBio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCN</th>
<th>Level of Understanding of the TCNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lichens &amp; Bryophites</td>
<td>[Diagram showing distribution of responses]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InVertnet</td>
<td>[Diagram showing distribution of responses]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-trophic</td>
<td>[Diagram showing distribution of responses]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Respondents (n=30)

- Very Low
- Low
- Neither High nor Low
- High
- Very High
Participants rated the formal presentations, breakout group sessions, and informal interactions all as effective means of learning about the TCNs with the formal presentations rated most highly. While one TCN member felt the formal presentations to be “superficial” and lacking in detail (likely due to the brevity of the talks), an iDigBio associate reported the formal talks raised questions discussed later during informal exchanges. Although the breakout groups were generally rated as effective means of learning about the TCNs, the written comments suggest otherwise with respondents noting that the breakout groups focused more on global or future issues rather than on current TCN activities.

**Effectiveness of Summit Activities for Learning about the TCNs**

One survey question asked respondents for suggestions as how to promote communication and collaboration among the TCNs. Ideas included the following:

- Quarterly meetings via telecom of small groups of representatives from each TCN, with outreach and IT having separate groups
- A listserv and/or online forum
- Quarterly newsletter
- A web page, list-serves, and wikis to keep up the discussions; some of these should be “seeded.”
- The iDigBio portal
- iDigBio supported web-based meetings
- Mechanism for members of TCNs to ask and/or share specific kinds of help with other TCNs
- Working groups
Knowledge about the Collaborators

Participants were asked to rate their knowledge of collaborators prior to the Summit. Knowledge ranged widely; respondents were most familiar with Specify, Geolocate, and Encyclopedia of Life.

![Knowledge about the Collaborators Prior to the Summit]

Most respondents reported the Summit was effective or very effective in helping them learn more about the various collaborators.

Effectiveness of the Summit in Learning About Collaborators

![Effectiveness of the Summit in Learning About Collaborators]
**Topic-focused Breakout Groups**

Each breakout group was presented with a list of deliverables to achieve during the sessions. Average ratings of progress by members of each group ranged from 55% to 77%. Responses to the open-ended questions offer little insight into the relative success of each group as participants of all groups tended to offer similar reflections.

![Ratings of Progress by Group Members](image)

Specifically, participants felt the discussions were collegial and that the facilitators were effective in moving the discussions forward. The most frequent comment reflected the importance of having group members with adequate expertise to address the topic. Some felt their groups were effective because of expert members while others commented their groups would have benefitted from additional expertise.
Enabling the National Resource Breakout Groups

Participants were divided into three breakout groups to address a range of issues related to the functioning of iDigBio and interactions among the TCNs and iDigBio among others. In general, participants felt their breakout group was successful, but there was consensus that the list of questions to address was too extensive to adequately address. Consequently, groups prioritized issues and covered some in depth while ignoring others.

Perceptions of Success of Enabling the National Resource Group Breakout Sessions by Members
Workshops

One of the tasks assigned to the Enabling the National Resource Working Groups was to suggest and prioritize future workshops. While each group included this information in their summary report, we asked the question on the survey as well to ensure that the views of TCN members could be isolated from those of other participants. Please note that one limitation of the data below is that the workshop topics were collapsed across issues raised in the three different groups and the resulting categories may not have meant the same thing to every respondent (e.g., some may view crowd sourcing and volunteers as part of outreach).

Ratings of Importance of Workshop Topics by TCN Members

Recommended Timing of Workshops by TCN Members (within 3 and 6 months combined)
Summit Organization

Summit participants were asked to rate several aspects of meeting planning, communication, and organization. They were also asked to evaluate the value of the list of deliverables for the topic-focused breakout group sessions, as well as respond to open-ended questions about the Summit. Overall, the Summit was regarded as very well organized.

Participant Ratings of Summit Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Communication about the Summit was timely and...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issues addressed were critical and relevant.

An appropriate amount of time was allocated to formal...

My roles and responsibilities at the meeting were clear and...

The level of detail was appropriate.

The number of deliverables was reasonable.

The list facilitated productive discussion.

The deliverables reflected the most important issues to be addressed.

Deliverables: Georeferencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>The list facilitated productive discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of deliverables was reasonable.

The level of detail was appropriate.

The deliverables reflected the most important issues to be addressed.
The deliverables reflected the most important issues to be addressed.

The level of detail was appropriate.

The number of deliverables was reasonable.

The list facilitated productive discussion.

Deliverables: Data Management

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Deliverables: Specimen Imaging

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
Summit participants offered a number of comments and suggestions to be considered for future meetings. The most frequent criticisms/concerns involved the number of formal presentations, especially those held in the evening and the tight schedule which precluded any question-answer periods.