



2019 LARGE FACILITIES WORKSHOP

APRIL 2-4 | TEXAS ADVANCED COMPUTING CENTER

Information Section

Topic:	Applying the Learning Culture Concept to NSF's Major Facilities Knowledge Management Program
Speaker(s) Name, Title:	Rebecca Yasky & Panel
Session Description:	
Session Time Slot:	3:20-5:15pm
Purpose and Desired Outcome:	

Notetaking Section

Scribe Name	
--------------------	--

Disclaimer: *These are raw notes that were captured by the assigned scribe during this session at the 2019 Large Facilities Workshop. This is one individual's interpretation of what took place during the session, and its content does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the National Science Foundation.*

Notes and Key Points:

- See next page.
-

Best Practices:

-
-

Actionable Recommendations (Action Owner Name & Organization):

-
-

Decisions:

-
-

Session Summary

Started with Rebecca Yasky's presentation and powerpoint presentation.

Gina Taberski – Brainstorming and info session to help provide input to NSF. Encourage and/or require.

Q: Is there an assumption that there is already an open, sharing culture? Or, like other places, is there a hesitancy to air 'dirty laundry' that needs to be overcome?

A: Gina/Rebecca – that is part of the answers and responses from your small groups in answering the questions on the slides.

Group #1:

Discussion about community list serve, amongst the facilities and not NSF.

Additional break-out sessions during this conference. Even one session to make connections & networking. Including lessons learned used (and means by which the info was gathered, for example, got it from the list serve) into reporting (annual report, for example) with NSF.

Group #2:

People already participating in forums to share lessons learned. Adding a 'requirement' may stifle disclosure and might actually even generate 'exaggeration' in sharing. Voluntary may be more candid.

Weight/value of lessons learned would lean towards required. (some said)

Means: Regular meetings between groups. Online forum. Might be a chilling effect if NSF runs the forum.

There is a need to put people at ease. Make the discussion part of this workshop, part of the goal would be to create a package of info to pass up to NSF (or NSF participate). LL and topics of concern.

Could also be silo'd into more specific forums, by topic, by type of facility, etc.

Emphasis on requests for 3rd party running it.

Req'd- Its hard to get most important ones out of a voluntary system.

Req'd – But only req'd to 'participate in some way'. Whichever way makes most sense to you and to your facility. (Kevin P)

Group #3:

More leaning towards required, but going back and forth. Mirrored a lot of existing suggestions of means.

Part of a proj management tool or annual report. Not necessarily negative connotation with lessons learned. Are there any other standards, PMI, etc, to create reporting.

Experience with technical conferences to establish competencies, dissemination of information is limited to the group, and may be expensive, but can be very effective for open communication and sharing.

Encouraged "plus". If you haven't contributed in a year or two, now you have to contribute. Program Officer may have to provide the oversight of submitted lessons learned for quality or quantity.

Encouraged puts it back on the NSF for an easy system or reminders, etc. That part of the system needs to work well. Read/attend should be required.

Concern: if you compel people, there would be a 'chilling' effect.

Gina- some things may be confidential for a facility. NSF would have to come back to the facility to 'clear' it for dissemination to ensure there is still value after 'cleared' to share with community.

Leaning towards encouragement. Aligned with how we see our own interests. Structure the process to align to buy-in.

Rebecca summary:

We are hearing 'encourage', and that is generally the NSF culture. We tried 'encourage' and there, for example, were a couple of groups we asked to present specific topics we thought would be good for the overall community.

Recipient example: use this session as an actual lessons learned 'capture' brainstorming session. Then share at the end of the session and post. Presentation method would be someone else presents your 'lesson learned' as a method to get past issues with sharing, understanding, etc.

Rebecca:

We focused this session on how to capture/identify lessons learned, because these discussions often drift towards trying to solve dissemination.

Recipient: Trust hinges on what is the intended outcome and what are you going to do with the information.

Tom G: Recipients are already sharing with the Program Officers on a regular basis. It may be good to tap the PO's and have them ask recipients, hey, there are one or two here that are interesting. Would you be willing to share more widely.

Recipient: The PIs are ultimately responsible for the award. Would be more comfortable to share if the PI were here to follow conversation, discuss, etc.