Tasks

Who	What	When	Status
Mark, Arnout, David	Create first pass at questions we'd like to address through survey or other means	Feb 20	Done, WG now taking it on
Janemarie, Alex, Nathan	Create first pass at list of constituencies, lists, meetings, individuals we'd like to reach for their input	Feb 20	Done, WG now taking it on
David W	Ensure that the various kinds of risks associated with federation is represented in the questions doc.	3/6	Done, WG now taking it on
Dedra C	Add more constituencies to the list	2/25	Done
Judith B, Laura P, Lucy L	Add model questions that rise above the way things currently are -- Model questions: Excerpt from Scenario Planning in Organizations re "the seven questions", page 22 of Scenario planning:strategic interviews and conversations, slide 7 of this presentation	3/20	See here
Lucy L	Add substance from LEARN slides into the questions doc	3/6	Done
Alex S	First pass at logistics https://docs.google.com/document/d/11tr PGfpcVrfBY2gHK7KL_WzPb1gdH2s8Nrx 7bkz5Z-Q/edit		Done
Tom B	Do we need to register for TNC19 to attend the working group meeting?		No registration needed for side meetings like this
Tom B	If needed, could arrange contacts with organizations that chose to drop from InCommon		Asked InC person to pull info on reasons given by orgs that have left.
Tom	Draft survey instrument based on interview questions, and draft message inviting people to take it		

Judith, Laura, Lucy	Revise/resolve remaining questions about Interview gdoc		

Wednesday, March 20, 2019

Attending: Nick Roy, Lucy Lynch, Pål Axelsson, Tom Barton, Mark Scheible, Shannon Roddy, Judith Bush, Laura Paglione, Alan Buxey, Albert Wu, Dedra Chamberlin, Janemarie Duh, David Bantz, Adam Lewenberg

Regrets: David W, Nathan Dors

Agenda:
1. Review tasks
2. Review draft interview "cheat sheet"

Spent almost the entire time going through this doc, very productively. Good opportunity to gain consensus around what this WG is really focusing on and the level of questions that will best help us - much higher level than most of the questions we'd worked on earlier, so that respondents are less tied to the ways things are at present, as well as to have them respond about the R&E activities they engage in without reference to how that's supported by federation at this time.

We agreed that this one set of questions will form the basis for both the live interview and survey modes, recognizing that some adaptation to the survey context might be appropriate. Some of the more detailed questions we worked on may yet prove useful to ask at some other point in the WG's process, and in any case we needed to try out a lot of questions in order to arrive at a sense of what questions we need to ask at this point in time.

Judith, Laura, and Lucy will revise the doc based on the discussion and comments within.
Tom will draft a survey form of these questions and circulate to the WG before our next meeting.

We'll aim to conduct interviews and invite survey participation roughly mid-April through mid-May, leaving ~1 month for us to analyze the results before our F@F meeting in Tallinn. Laura proposed a schedule:

1. send to this committee - gather responses within a week? two weeks? (by April 7)
2. pre-analyze these results for the purpose of understanding if the questions are getting the types of responses that we are looking for (by April 17 meeting)
3. Launch the survey to the broader community - aim to get responses within 2 (3?) weeks (by May 1 meeting)

4. Analyze the results / summarize / share with this group. Interview for clarification. (by May 15 meeting)

3. We have focused on two means of gathering input, a survey and a live interview format. Let's make some choices:
    a. Do we agree to proceed with a survey? If so ...
        i. What time-to-complete should we limit ourselves to?
        ii. Will the survey ask what type of person is responding and show only those questions corresponding to their selection? Ie, end-user, SP operator, new entrants, … the groups of questions we have arranged.
        iii. Which 1-2 of us will agree to edit the survey questions to fit within the constraints of the answers to the previous two questions? Results of their editing work to be reviewed by the WG before proceeding to create an actual survey.
            1. Same people to draft text of the email invitation to take the survey
        iv. Shall we aim to send out survey invitations by April 10 (one week after our next WG call)?
            1. Tom is checking into using UChicago's Qualtrics instance, as one option. UChicago's Google is another, perhaps preferred (easier!).
        v. Keep the survey open for 2 weeks? 3 weeks? 4 weeks? Other?
    b. Do we agree to proceed with live interviews? If so …
        i. How long should each interview be scheduled for?
        ii. How many interviewers should participate in each interview?
        iii. How many interviewees should be scheduled together?
        iv. How many such interviews should we attempt?
        v. Who will agree to be on the interview team?
        vi. During what period should interviews be scheduled?
        vii. How will specific interviewees be identified?
        viii. How should we handle the logistics of scheduling interviews?
    c. Do we still want to invite some people to give us unstructured feedback? If so …

        Basically, No.

        i. How shall we identify them?
        ii. Who will formulate and send the message to ask for their contribution?
    d. Other business