learn

LEARN Conference: Managing the Data Deluge: roles and responsibilities for your institution. - 5th May 2017 at Senate House, London

LEARN Conference evaluation

Where appropriate respondents scored each question using a scale of 1-5 where 1 = Poor and 5 = Excellent

---

1. How suitable was the venue of Senate House for the LEARN Conference?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	0	3	7	21	31	62	4.29
%	0.00	4.84	11.29	33.87	50	100	

---

2. How adequate did you find the administrative and catering arrangements for the conference to support the success of the event?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	0	1	2	24	36	63	4.51
%	0.00	1.59	3.17	38.1	57.14	100	

---

3. How useful did you find the paper given by Professor Kurt Deketeleare?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	0	3	11	22	27	63	4.16
%	0.00	4.76	17.46	34.92	42.86	100	

---

4. How useful did you find the paper given by Dr Eva Mendez Rodriguez?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	0	2	7	32	22	63	4.17
%	0.00	3.17	11.11	50.79	34.92	100	

5. How useful did you find the paper given by Dr Per Öster?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	1	5	14	27	15	62	3.81
%	1.61	8.06	22.58	43.55	24.19	100	

6. How useful did you find the paper given by Dr Claudio Gutierrez?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	1	3	16	19	16	55	3.84
%	1.82	5.45	29.09	34.55	29.09	100	

7. Was there enough time allowed for questions and discussion in the two panel sessions?

	Yes	No	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	55	8	63	1.87
%	87.3	12.7	100	

8. How useful were the afternoon parallel tutorial sessions to ask questions and express your own opinions?

Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Weighted Average
Respondents	0	7	9	26	20	62	3.95
%	0	11.29	14.52	41.94	32.26	100	

9. Please name one way in which you think the conference and/or the LEARN Project's outputs have helped you to develop your professional knowledge.

Created new connections in understanding of RDM and developed new insights

Speaking to colleagues in other institutions on managing 'live' data vs 'archived' data

Learnt about what others are doing as an example to follow.

Meet colleagues working and with experience in research data management.

The report on the project's results presents very interesting points to consider when preparing a data management policy.

I sometimes feel the problem is so big I don't know where to start - the toolkit gives a framework for assessing strengths and weaknesses, which can then be used to prioritise actions.

Getting up to date on the outcomes of the project and awareness of the content of the outputs.

Provided a broader perspective outside of my institution and role

References (initiatives and literature).

The toolkit, and the experience and support gained in the project, give me authority and information to help me develop a principle-based service.

The morning's plenary sessions were useful to sketch the landscape. In particular, I learned that the FAIR principles are becoming more widely adopted.

Informative keynotes

The papers and particularly the specialized tutorial proved crucial for an ongoing bid that my department is involved in.

Good to know about the 'taboo to policy' spectrum. Helpful framework for thinking.

Workshops and Toolbox

Given me a broader awareness of approaches being taken in different institutions and given me ideas, which could be adapted or replicated in some way.

Development of research policies, authors' rights and repositories.

The workshops

The Toolkit is an invaluable resource for developing our RDM strategy and service, and has come at a good time for us when the service is about to change and guidance is much appreciated in this regard. The viewpoint of Latin America and the Caribbean was very valuable.

Very helpful overview of main issues and an excellent opportunity to discuss issues with colleagues

---

Costing workshop was really valuable in informing my thinking on DMP costing and resource sustainability

---

Developed a model RDM policy which can be used by research performing institutions

---

Toolkit useful for understanding basics.

I think the RDM toolkit is an excellent resource, and one, which I will be sharing with colleagues in the sector.

The Conference and Project outputs have helped me as an assessment tool by which to measure my University's position in the landscape of Open Research Data Management

---

Further awareness of wider efforts in this field.

The conference gave me a far greater understanding of EU policy and attitudes around RDM/Open Data. The template RDM policy plus the suggestions on SMT engagement are also extremely useful tools for use at the small university where I work.

Broader awareness of European activities in area of RDM

The practical usability of the presentations in every-day life at my institution.

The panel discussion had some interesting questions asked and some even more interesting answers

---

Inspiration, good ideas, network

The templates for policy, use cases are all very helpful.

Suggestions for future developments in my university

The toolkit is a fantastic resource and I learned a lot from reading all of the case studies.

Ability to engage with colleagues

It has given me insight into the variety of preparedness for RDM, and how across research organisations, researchers and nations there are different levels of maturity. This is useful in my role as a national actor in terms of setting directions with stakeholders to move research data management forward.

It is good to hear what 'the community' is thinking.

I will use the model policy for my own institution

Mostly just exposure to new ideas and to the experiences of other participants. It was a really great day for me. I learned a lot.

---

10. Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding the LEARN Conference to inform possible future events?

I just want to congratulate the project partners for their great job. The LEARN project has not only developed useful tools, but has also tested them using practical examples, which is very useful information that other institutions can use.

The room was quite long and narrow, meaning people at the back were a long way from the screen.

No need to waste paper by printing off the 80 something page booklet for everyone.

Great collection of people to bring together, much appreciated

Venue: a lecture room might have been more useful for the plenary sessions. Catering: it was hard to eat the food provided without tables etc. Tutorials: the one I attended (RDM implementation) wasn't really a tutorial but more a discussion session.

The groups could have been discipline-oriented.

The pretty much hands on costing RDM should become a firm feature.

What is going to be the future of LEARN project? Will there be a new project?

To develop skills for management of research products in repositories.

Mini workshop very useful.

More time for the tutorial sessions, less time for the panel sessions

I don't think enough people are talking about the impact the GDPR [General Data Protection Regulation] will have on RDM more broadly, and the policies/services we are developing more specifically. As a European project, there was a real missed opportunity here to begin a cross-national conversation around these issues - the afternoon panel session would have been a good opportunity for this. It may be that we are too early in the game for this conversation but I think this group is ideal to lead the RDM community in the impact of the implementation of the GDPR on RDM. The morning session was too long. I was straining to be attentive by the last two morning speakers. It is good to put as much information as possible in the programme, but if people are not attentive, it is wasted effort and unfair to the speakers. A 9:30 start (with 9am registration and refreshments) could have facilitated a small break.

Could have had more direction/structure to the tutorial session. An extra speaker and more Q&A time for all speakers might have been more useful than final panel session.

LEARN has raised awareness of RDM issues and acts as a beacon of Best Practice

The conference was very well organized and useful. Including more about the humanities and social sciences would be useful. Catering where there is adequate seating would be better and less luncheon and general catering carbs would be appreciated.

Well-organised and a packed and informative programme. I did however think that that both panels took up a lot of the event time (length of each session was quite long) and I would have liked to have had more discussion around issues that have a practical effect on RDM service delivery. The high-level strategic outputs and topics covered were discussed widely, but I don't think the practical implications were discussed enough.

The tutorial sessions could have been more useful if they had been structured to deliver some practical desired outcomes eg. 7 practical ways to increase awareness of Open data research requirements amongst early career researchers.

Enjoyed the 'Engaging early career researchers' workshop as it gave us chance to talk in small groups about RDM activities.

Keep up the good work!

Many thanks for the conference. It's good to see the completion of the project and the outputs being delivered and taken up by the community. There was a buzz at the event and a lot of broader online engagement. Overall, I felt there were too many presentations and not enough discussion or workshop time, which was a shame, as there was clearly an engaged community willing to exchange lessons. The morning would have benefited from a coffee break. Reducing the number of keynotes and only running 1 rather than 2 panels would have helped with the overall structure. It would have been nice if the tutorials were a bit more practical or run in rooms laid out cabaret style to facilitate group discussion and sharing. The toolkit seems a useful resource, but the format is perhaps a little dense and difficult for people to find the most useful pathway through. It would help to make suggestions for implementation. Perhaps provide some scenarios e.g. If your question is X, do this, or if your issue / focus is Y, check out... The survey will be a good starting point for many, irrespective of what stage they are at, and you could provide recommendations that point people towards the relevant case studies or practical tips from them based on their responses. Some kind of online version of the toolkit would have been a bit more interactive and reusable.

Chancellors Hall is a lovely venue but its length and narrowness is not perfect. It is always a challenge to have discussion and to learn from outputs. I think, although this cannot always work, a day and a half would perhaps be better for discussion and sharing. There was limited sharing of views, issues and practice. However, this worked ok for the final event perhaps.

For topics whose impacts are so wide reaching, a broader community of participants should be sought. In today's conference for example, it would have been good to hear from researchers in Geophysics or Astronomy for example - those whose fields of interest will really test the resilience of the policies under discussion. Pilot studies undertaken in Humanities will not really provide useful information for anticipating the future needs of Big Science.

I think the breakout sessions deserved more time and some kind of hands on work.

It seemed to me we went over a lot of old ground again today.

This may seem somewhat obvious, but participants should have a place to sit down during lunch.