

Research Portals in the Arts and Humanities (RPAH)

Minutes from the Project Board Meeting

10-10-2005

Present:

- Professor Mark Greengrass (RPAH Project Director) – M.G.
- Professor Stephen Brown (RPAH Project Director) – S.B.
- Michael Fraser (Director of Humbul portal) – M.F.
- Jane Burgess (Manager of Artifact portal) – Jane B.
- Jared Bryson (RPAH research assistant) – Jared B.
- David Gerrard (RPAH New Media Designer) – D.G.

Apologies from:

- Sheila Anderson (Director AHDS)
- Robb Ross (RPAH Project Manager) - R.R.

1: Project Terms of Reference.

MG asked for feedback on a draft the TOR for the project. It was particularly emphasised that the project is an analysis of the activities and needs of researchers, not the performance of service providers.

It was also noted that the help of the service providers to raise awareness of the project and help disseminate its findings would be gratefully accepted.

Action: MG and SB will contact Sheila Anderson to discuss how the project will interface with the AHDS. For instance:

- Do we work directly with the AHDS management at Kings College?
- Do we work with a nominated representatives of the individual AHDS service providers?
- Do we try and involve all the in some way service providers?

Action: R.R will contact Claire Warwick from the LAIRAH project to invite her to join the project board.

2: Project Progress- draft user questionnaire for mapping research domain.

A draft user questionnaire was presented to the board and feedback taken. An updated / annotated version of the questionnaire will be forwarded to Jared B. for further development. "Scoping questions" to introduce the research activities need careful consideration.

Action: D.G. will produce annotated second draft and forward to project team.

Action: Jared B. will work upon third draft of questionnaire, with particular regard to scoping questions.

The third draft will then be tested on staff from the University of Sheffield and De Montfort, and passed to the Centre for Information Behaviour and the Evaluation of Research (CIBER) at UCL for further feedback before being placed online.

Action: Jared B. will write a short piece of promotional text to advertise the questionnaire on other sites.

Action: Jane B. and MF will promote the questionnaire on the Artifact and Humbul sites.

See also AOB.

3: Progress: collating sample service provider data.

M.G. presented a report into service providers and their methods of capturing usage data, authored by Tom Leng at the early stages of the project. Thanks were offered to Tom for fitting in this work at short notice by the Project Board.

The project aims to analyse all data collected post 2003. It was noted that CIBER have agreed to analyse the data collected from service providers on our behalf.

Reference was also made to the RDN Performance Measurement Framework document, which in turn refers to other documents investigating methods for evaluating service provider usage. It also sets out requirements for service providers to report on their usage, which are to be implemented post 01/08/2005.

Actions:

1. Jared B. to investigate this document and compile a list of the previous reports into service usage noted within it.
2. Jared B. to investigate the service usage reporting requirements laid out within the document to ensure that CIBER do not replicate work on post 2003 data that the service providers are already obliged to do themselves.
3. M.G. and Jared B. to begin work on scoping our requirements for analysis of usage data, and to make contact with CIBER by the beginning of November to outline these requirements. These will be fed back to M.F.

4. Once these requirements are decided upon, M.F. will provide an interim sample of data to test analysis procedures with early in November. This data will be cleaned to anonymise and remove as much “non-human” activity as possible.
5. M.F. will ensure that the bulk of the remaining data collection work from Humbul usage logs will continue during the rest of November for delivery by the year end at the latest.

It was noted by S.B. that, should our original project schedule be adhered to, the earliest a data analysis report could be expected with this data delivery date is 01/05/2006. This was considered later than desirable, so effort may be needed to reduce the time taken to analyse the data and write the report.

4: Progress: focus groups

Tom Leng’s report contains a shortlist of history conferences to conduct focus groups at. This was considered too short, so more potential opportunities were suggested:

- Archaeology conferences (which take place in Dec.)
- Learned society meetings.
- Methods Network events.
- Peer review college events.
- HEAC subject centre events.

Action: Jared B. to continue Tom’s scoping work, contacting the above (and others).

5: Progress: portal and portlet demonstrator

Action: Jane B. will contact D.G. with contact details for the now completed RDN Portlet Demonstrator Development Project. D.G. will contact them in turn to see if they have anything that could be used / adapted for this project.

Action: D.G. will become the repository for all information about portal / portlet design and technology and will keep the project informed of findings as necessary.

6: Delphi Forecasting

It was noted that this is the most neglected part of the project at present, as it depends upon feedback / contact details from the online questionnaire. It is anticipated that this exercise will now have to take place between the start of January and the end of February 2006.

Jared B. expressed confidence that a lot could be achieved in a short space of time using this technique, however, especially if email is used.

7: Meeting Schedule

There will be three more Project Board meetings during the remainder of the project. The proposed dates are:

1. Weeks commencing 9th or 16th January 2006.
2. Weeks commencing 1st May or 8th May 2006.
3. Week beginning 11th September 2006.

Action: R.R. will set up Meetomatic to come up with some more precise dates.

8: AOB

M.G. emphasised the importance of project outreach and awareness raising, particularly given the shortness of the project.

Action: all project members to consider RPAH outreach and feedback upon potential publicity opportunities at next meeting.