
NSDI Cooperative Agreements Program
Don't Duck Metadata
Project Report: Interim and Final

Responses to this form may also be submitted in a text document by email.
Please send text to dpainter@fgdc.gov.

Agreement Number LA4-6011-0033

Interim Report

Final Report This is a final report

Organization:

Name/unit/office: National Park Service Ecological Inventory and Monitoring
Program, Great Lakes Network Office

Street Address:

Line 1: 2800 Lakeshore Dr., East

Line 2: Suite D

City/State: Ashland, WI

Zip: 56480

Website address: <http://www.nature.nps.gov/im/units/glkn/>

Collaborating Organizations:

If applicable list organization name and point of contact

Wisconsin State Cartographer's Office

A.J. Wortley 608-265-8106

lwortley@facstaff.wisc.edu

Natural Resources Information Management

Eric Landis 651-275-0775

elandis@ix.netcom.com

Project Leader

Name: Ulf Gafvert

Telephone: 715-682-0631 x22

Fax: 715-682-6190

E-mail: ulf_gafvert@nps.gov

1. Number of Metadata files created as a result of this project: Unknown, possibly helped facilitate 30-40 records.
Comments (optional): What we've learned is that training is one required element

of successful metadata creation. See attached survey, esp. responses to question 7.

2. Clearinghouse Service

Is the metadata resulting from this project being served at a Clearinghouse site where it can be discovered and accessed?

Some metadata records are being posted to the NPS GIS Data Clearinghouse.

What is the Clearinghouse address:

http://www.nps.gov/gis/data_info/clearinghouse.html

Comments (optional): It's still a little early in the process since the workshop to fully evaluate this.

3. For projects who received training assistance:

Number of individuals that received training 24

Is metadata documentation and creation a part of your organizations workflow?

Describe

For some NPS units it is a part of the workflow. This principally depends on staffing (e.g. if a Data Specialist or GIS Specialist is available). The Great Lakes Network is hiring a full-time data manager which will facilitate the inclusion of metadata in the workflow for all Network parks.

4. For projects providing training assistance:

Number of workshops conducted: 1

List name of organizations and number of individuals trained respectively:

National Park Service (Mississippi NRRRA, Voyageurs National Park, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Grand Portage National Monument, Isle Royale National Park, Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, and Great Lakes Network Office) – 16 trainees

US Fish and Wildlife Service -1 trainee

University of Wisconsin – 1 trainee

Bad River Tribe – 2 trainees

Lac Courte Oreilles Tribe – 2 trainees

Red Cliff Tribe – 1 trainee

Lac du Flambeau Tribe – 1 trainee

Comments (optional):

5. For projects providing state or regional coordination:
Describe accomplishments and challenges in coordination (no more than 120 words):

N/A

6. Project Narrative (no more than 120 words):
Summarize the project activities. Include its accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and next steps.

What areas need work?

This project was a two-day hands-on metadata training workshop held in Ashland, WI. (Originally two one-day workshops were planned for a total of 25 participants). 24 federal, state and tribal natural resource personnel participated in the training conducted by A.J. Wortley. Trainees left with a good understanding of FGDC metadata, the availability and use of metadata entry tools and resources to support their metadata creation efforts. A follow-up survey (compilation of results attached) was conducted by Eric Landis. Follow-up phone and in-person interviews have also been conducted (results forthcoming).

Changing from a one-day workshop to a two-day workshop was beneficial. Never-the-less, it's felt that metadata training requires more time with a one-day orientation and up to three-day onsite training.

7. Feedback on Don't Duck Metadata Program:
The goal of DDM program is to provide organizations with assistance for metadata creation and clearinghouse service through (a.) training, and (b.) metadata creation experience so that metadata documentation becomes part of an organizations normal workflow. What are the program strengths and weaknesses?
Where does the program make a difference?
Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?
What would you recommend doing differently?
Are there factors that are missing or need to be considered that were missed?
Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed? Timeframe?

Follow-up surveys and phone interviews with workshop participants indicated a very favorable response to the workshop. Some participants felt that the aspect where they gained the most knowledge was more in regards to the importance of metadata development than the actual metadata development process. The DDM

program seems to make a difference on both fronts, education of metadata and metadata entry. Those that benefited most on metadata entry were generally individuals whose position (e.g. data or GIS specialists) may require metadata development. The others (e.g. biologists, resource management specialists) gained a better understanding of what metadata is and its value.

The assistance received from FGDC was very effective. In particular, the trainer was very qualified and highly organized with the training schedule and materials.

Some participants felt that training should be conducted at the organization's site. In other words, the trainer travels and trains each trainee using their equipment, facilities, and datasets. One trainee noted that this would also allow the trainer to customize the training to the conditions the trainee faces, e.g. budget limitations, software availability, etc.