

GLAM-Wiki 2013, 12-14 April 2013, British Library

Feedback form – summary of responses

We received 69 feedback forms from attendees to GLAM-Wiki 2013.

Note: the feedback has been given a numerical value to aid analysis, with the bottom of the scale (eg: “very bad”) being given one and the top (eg: “very good”) a value of five.

1. Overall, how would you rate the event?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	4	21	43	4.54

2. Was a good range of topics covered?

Answer options	No				Yes	Mean rating
	1	0	5	31	32	4.35

3. Were the topics relevant to you?

Answer options	Not at all relevant				Yes very relevant	Mean rating
	1	0	5	32	31	4.33

4. How would you rate the introductory session?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	1	11	17	22	4.12

5. How would you rate Michael Edson’s talk on “Scope, Scale and Speed”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	2	7	47	4.74

6. How would you rate the session on “Partnership Reports: UK”?

Answer	Very bad				Very	Mean
--------	----------	--	--	--	------	------

options					good	rating
	0	0	2	3	5	4.30

7. How would you rate the session on “Open Content: where are we today”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	2	10	5	4.18

8. How would you rate the session on “Working with digital content”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	1	4	2	3.88

9. How would you rate Lizzy Jongma’s talk on “The Rijksmuseum is open”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	1	21	31	4.5

10. How would you rate Geer Oskam’s talk on “Europeana and Wikimedia”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	4	14	19	14	3.84

11. How would you rate the session on “Partnership Reports: Outside the UK”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	1	8	3	4.17

12. How would you rate the session on “Engaging with institutional staff”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	0	6	5	4.25

13. How would you rate the session on “Europeana GLAM-Wiki toolset”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	1	12	3	4.00

14. How would you rate the session on “Partnership Reports: Science”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	0	1	2	4.67

15. How would you rate the session on “What are the risks”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	2	8	5	4.00

16. How would you rate the session on “New tools”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	4	9	3	3.76

17. How would you rate Mia Ridge’s talk on “A short history of open cultural data”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	2	8	16	19	4.16

18. How would you rate the workshop on “Wikimedia for GLAMs: Wikipedia”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	0	5	2	4.29

19. How would you rate the session on “Starting a project: how do we begin”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	4	11	10	4.15

20. How would you rate the open session?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	2	0	0	3.00

21. How would you rate the workshop on “Wikimedia for GLAMs: Commons”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	3	1	1	1	3.00

22. How would you rate the session on “Striking the balance”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	1	7	8	4.24

23. How would you rate the session on “Wikidata: background and discussion”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	2	6	2	0	2.82

24. How would you rate the workshop on “Wikimedia for GLAMs: licensing”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	1	0	6	2	4.00

25. How would you rate the session on “Engaging with maps”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	1	7	6	4.13

26. How would you rate the session on “Measuring the impact of openness”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	2	9	3	4.07

27. How would you rate the session on “Wikimedia for GLAMs: communities”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	1	0	0	1	10	4.58

28. How would you rate the workshop on “GLAM-Wiki Europeana toolset”?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	0	0	3	8	6	4.18

29. What did you think of THATcamp?

Answer options	Very bad				Very good	Mean rating
	3	0	3	9	6	3.71

30. Which days of GLAM-Wiki 2013 did you attend?

Answer options	Thursday – social events	Friday	Saturday	Sunday – THAT camp unconference
	10	60	54	34

31. What were the best things about GLAM-Wiki 2013?

Of the 69 people who filled out feedback forms, 47 discussed what the best aspects of the conference were. Praise was distributed between the quality of the talks, the range of topics covered, and the networking opportunities. Several people particularly singled out Michael Edson’s talk on “Scope, Scale and Speed”.

See Appendix 1 for further details.

32. What did you learn from the conference?

There were 40 responses in all to this question, with a wide range of responses. People talked about learning to be ambitious and not afraid of working with Wikimedia.

See Appendix 2 for further details.

33. What sessions did you find most useful?

Of the 38 people who gave details on which sessions they found most useful, by far the most popular session (20) was Michael Edson’s talk on “Scope, Scale and Speed”, with the inspiration it gave attendees a recurring theme amongst responses. Lizzy Jongma’s talk on the reopening of the Rijksmuseum also proved popular, and like Edson’s talk was praised for being inspiring.

The workshops were also popular, and “Starting a project” was highlighted as providing insight into the processes of beginning to work with Wikimedia. The unconference also proved popular, in particular the hacking as it allowed people to get hands on.

See Appendix 3 for further details.

34. What sessions did you find least useful and why?

While 38 people responded to the question about what they found useful, half that number stated what they did not find useful. Six people identified the presentation on Wikidata as not useful to them; the reasons given were varied with one person remarking they “didn’t learn much” and another remarking that it was “interesting but not workshop enough”. As many people commented that the Europeana Toolset workshops weren’t useful to them, with people saying they were not yet sure how they would be using the tools. The most commonly highlighted sessions have been mentioned, but common topics on the reasons for sessions not being useful was that in many cases there wasn’t enough time for questions.

See Appendix 4 for further details.

35. What should we do differently if we run the event again?

There were a variety of comments, with a few people asking for THATcamp to be long, one person suggesting there should be an official hotel closer to the venue, and a couple of people noting that having coffee and snacks more readily available outside of lunch and scheduled coffee breaks would be an improvement. Several of the replies to this question remarked that they wouldn’t change a thing.

See Appendix 5 for further details.

36. Are you a:

Answer options	Wikimedian	GLAM professional	THATcamper
	29	22	2

37a. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in editathons?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	20	30	60.0

37b. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in training sessions to teach staff and e-volunteers how to edit Wikipedia?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	24	26	52.0

37c. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in Wikimedians in Residence?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	23	27	54.0

37d. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in QRpedia?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	30	40	40.0

37e. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in photography sessions?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	22	28	56.0

37f. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in release of digital content such as image libraries to Commons and Wikisource?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	11	39	78.0

37g. In the next 12 months are you likely to participate in categorisation of digital archives and using them to illustrate articles?

Answer options	No	Yes	% saying yes
	22	28	56.0

38. Anything else you would like to add?

People generally used this section to say they enjoyed the event, with suggestions that presentations on the gender gap project in the Netherlands and Wikimania would be useful.

See Appendix 6 for further details.

Appendix 1: What were the best things about GLAM-Wiki 2013?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Good presentations, warm atmosphere”

“Informative sessions, plenty of discussion, no preaching, great unconference sessions, passionate individuals”

“Inspiring talks, opportunity to meet people doing similar projects - has given me *lots* of food for thought!”

“Venue, approachability of all delegates, friendly atmosphere”

“Good vibes”

“Networking sharing views/idea”

“The people”

“Things for beginners”

“Different perspectives. Could we have, do we have uni-wiki?”

“Networking exchange within the movement Learning of other projects”

“Smithsonian/networking”

“Edson's talk”

“Meeting people, great presentations”

“Location, keynotes, people”

“Meeting people, starting things”

“To talk to everyone in person, quick meetings, getting inspired, loads of info”

“In contact with colleagues and sharing experiences and ideas”

“Great inspirational lectures”

“Got many ideas, especially from the panels/workshops”

“Very useful briefing”

“Inspiration from best practice”

“Good organizational structure and flowed smoothly. Was nice to hear what chapters and Wikimedians were doing.”

“Meeting fellow GLAMers and getting some new input. Joint meeting for national GLAM-coordinators. Presentation on potential among GLAMs.”

“Meeting a lot of interesting people; inspiration; networking”

“Excellent keynote speakers Very good sessions”

“Great mix of topics”

“Meeting wiki friends”

“The atmosphere. The focus on: getting things done!”

“Meeting people”

“Good people to chat with”

“Putting faces to name and exchanging notes with other volunteers”

“Range of people and ideas present”

“Great keynote, very well found in combination with the rest, all others could build upon it”

“Spirit of collaboration”

“Meeting people, networking”

“Venue and place”

“Meeting so many people, hearing about the great work”

“Lots of time for discussion, experts in the field present, great keynotes”

“Talking to people I haven't met before”

“Chance to meet others in the wiki community in person”

“Excellent opening. Useful to find out more about WikiDate and editing Wikipedia.”

“Good overview, good discussion. Michael Edson Keynote. Practical eg: starting Wikipedia”

“People and place”

“Meet people”

“Networking opportunity and keynote talks”

“Learnt so much, thank you!”

“THE PEOPLE! BRILLIANT COMMUNITY”

Appendix 2: What did you learn from the conference?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“How to be ambitious!”

“How to kick start a Wikipedia project, engage with communities, risks and rewards of donating content”

“Lots of interesting projects/weblinks. Practical guidance on running GLAM-wiki projects. Useful to place Wikipedia in the wider context of open data”

“Not to be scared of wiki!”

“A million things”

“Potential for a GLAM to work with wiki”

“A lot”

“How to make use of wiki-related things in other events”

“Wiki people are so optimistic! Renewed faith!”

“That we need to scale up”

“Scale”

“Scaling is important 10x improvement is important”

“GW toolset”

“Lots”

“Highlights: community interaction, coding, international scalability network”

“Toolset and much more”

“A lot of ideas, sharing”

“Various smaller ideas (good ones!)”

“A lot of leads for the staff I will work with”

“Wonderful projects like Rijksmuseum”

“That Wikimedians aren't very good at explaining to GLAM professionals what they're talking about - they often forget not everyone is a Wikimedian. More hands on activities and better facilitators - not every Wikipediaian is a facilitator.”

“Too much to cover here”

“That I'm not alone in wanting to have more tech”

“Mostly about new tools, other's experiences”

“GLAMs are more engaged with Wikimedia than ever before”

“About the breadth and energy of GLAMwiki”

“How to edit a Wikipedia page!”

“Found tech sessions very valuable as I don't often work directly there but should know about how it works.”

“Bits and pieces”

“A gazillion ways of getting things started up and running”

“Range of GLAM initiative and international scope”

“What projects and tools there are”

“How to develop an effective collaboration between GLAM and wiki”

“What Wikidata is - some of the new things happening”

“The current state of GLAM work”

“Much clearer on Wikipedia, media and data differences. Clarification and more thoughts on the (difficulty) of opening data.”

“Open”

“Potential of GLAM-Wiki”

“About other institutions work/experience”

“SCOPE SCALE & SPEED”

Appendix 3: What sessions did you find most useful?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Michael Edson!”

“Starting a new project - directly relevant”

“Michael Edson - inspiring! And helped to shape many discussion over the weekend (kept returning to idea of scale)”

“Wiki Commons Risks - good to have summary”

“Open access journal session”

“Edson - most power”

“Michael Edson - big vision”

“How to edit Wikipedia”

“Learn to code”

“Plenary”

“Michael Edson 'Scope Scale and Speed”

“Michael Edson”

“Scale”

“Edson's talk”

“Edson”

“Starting a project - the beartraps of interacting with the community”

“Toolset GLAM”

“The Rijksmuseum is Open”

“Keynote – inspirational”

“Beat's presentation on potential among GLAM”

“Scope, scale, and speed - inspirational!”

“Coding session of THATcamp”

“Edson keynote – inspiring”

“Open session”

“GLAM communities - social issues”

“Learning and teaching programming”

“M Edson keynotes”

“Rijksmuseum - nice talk on open GLAM I didn't know about”

“M Edson”

“Starting a project - practical advice that is very useful”

“Science”

“Michael Edson”

“Inspiring talk on Rijksmuseum”

“Michael Edson: entertaining, informative, inspiring”

“M. Edson”

“Michael Edson”

“Keynote on Friday”

“Talk by Michael Edson”

“Communities session - useful when engaging digital humanities”

“Lizzy Jongma - exciting digital strategies a GLAM can use”

“Rijksmuseum - inspirational approach”

“Jongma - most insight”

“Mia Ridge - past informing future”

“How to upload images to Commons”

“Communities/US partnerships”

“Maos”

“Lizzy Jongma”

“Lizzy Jongma's talk”

“Communities - good overview”

“Rijksmuseum is Open”

“Starting a project”

“Rijksmuseum - good example for other GLAMs”

“glam toolset”

“The Rijksmuseum is Open - inspirational!”

“OLH of THAT camp”

“Unconference hacking - achieved something”

“Michael Edson – inspiration”

“Wikipedia editing”

“Edson - good ideas for future thinking”

“Engaging institutional staff - practical advice that is very useful”

“UK partnerships”

“Wikimedia for GLAMs, workshop IV”

“Mia Ridge - very informative on background of current GLAM approaches”

“Rijksmuseum”

“New tools”

“Open Content”

“Engaging staff - directly relevant”

“Partnership reports UK - useful to learn from other projects”

“Wikipedia workshop - useful reminder of purpose”

“Engaging with maps - own project ideas”

“Learn and teach programming”

“Open library of humanities”

“Wikimedia Workshop I”

“Mia's talk”

“Scope, scale, speed – inspiring”

“Engaging institutional staff”

“Wikidata”

“THATcamp: beginners session - shared issues”

“OLH”

“GLAM toolset - didn't know about this work going on”

“Partnership reports (UK) - practical advice that is very useful”

“GLAM toolset”

“Lizzy Jongma”

“Starting a new project panel - lots of very practical advice”

“Museum Open Content Experience”

“What are the risks - worrying but informative”

“Starting a project - how do we begin? - practical and relevant”

“Wiki Commons workshop - good practical advice”

“Wikimedia for GLAMs - Wikipedia - Virgin user, all nsw”

“Learn and teach”

“Lizzy Jongma – Rijksmuseum”

“John C unconference about the Star Trek tricorder problem”

“The pub! - nearly as important as the sessions”

“Engaging with maps”

“national coordinator meeting”

“Open content: where we are - shared issues”

“Striking the balance -useful to hear many perspectives”

“Rijksmuseum - blew my brain away and made me think of different things in a new

light”

“Europeana”

“Open content - where we are today”

“Europeana”

Appendix 4: What sessions did you find least useful and why?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Engaging with maps - mostly about geo-referencing, would have been useful if it was broader in scope”

“Wiki toolset - not yet of use to me”

“Panel: Striking the balance - lacked focus”

“Where to start - too many panel members and long questions (not widen engagement)”

“Past partnerships UK - too crammed, too little discussion”

“Commons workshop - no computer room”

“Workshop 2 commons - should have been better prepared. Chaotic.”

“Toolset workshop - I am not technical”

“Edson's keynote”

“Wikidata - interesting but not workshop enough”

“Wikidata could have been presented more professionally”

“Wikidata introduction”

“Wikidata - over my head (oh well!)”

“Starting a project - a little confused”

“Wikimedia for GLAMs: Commons - structure wasn't geared towards GLAM professionals”

“Wikidata - didn't learn much new”

“Striking the balance (it was good but too hermetic for me - don't take it personally)”

“What are the risks by Fae. Very, very negative. Perhaps ok in informal discussion between Commons users in the pub, but exceptionally scary for GLAM professionals”

“Europeana”

“Wikidata background - would have been useful to talk about some of the issues around Wikidata - 'more a how to”

“Europeana - not yet of use to me”

“GLAM-Wiki toolset - not relevant to me”

“Final THATcamp (it didn't happen!)”

“Europeana toolset - too crammed too little discussion”

“Licensing - no negative examples”

“Geer Oskam - not really clear what the message/intention was”

“Striking the balance - not clear purpose and objective”

Appendix 5: What should we do differently if we run the event again?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Mix of sessions and talks was good. Unconference was incredibly useful.”

“Workshops could have small-group activities and discussion (which could then feed back to whole group) the format was very similar to the talks”

“Days should not be longer. Plan trips outside.”

“Nothing springs to mind”

“Advertise the right start time!”

“More defined opportunities for practical (like AGS into to wiki) during GLAM”

“Inform even better how the session are documented - hand out a list of attendees”

“Great!”

“Provide stroop waffles Better/more social events, backstage tours etc”

“Can't think of anything”

“(more) unconference”

“Having breakfast; a better tour - such as in a GLAM (it was raining); a visit to the British Library”

“Even more practical/hands on stuff for more specific target audiences”

“Too many "keynotes" - heck, Michael didn't even stick around for the rest of the event. (I understand why Lizzy had to leave) And none of the keynotes were given by Wikimedians, which is weird. And none of them even talked about partnerships.”

“I found this conference very disappointing. I attended as someone working in GLAM to find out how we could contribute to and harness the power of Wikipedia. I came with an open mind, but mindful that many of my colleagues have very closed minds. They would need a lot of convincing to: *change their ways. *do something different *accept they're not the only experts *be generous with their time, expertise, and knowledge My main criticisms are in two categories: 1) the conference itself 2) culture On the Friday, in the two most interesting talks - Michael Edson and Lizzy Jongma - neither really mentioned Wikipedia at all! The partnership reports should not have been at same time as other interesting talks - this is the king of stuff GLAMs need to hear: how it has worked elsewhere, how it is going. Inspiration! A bit less time for lunch, breaks, coffee and more to hear about specific projects would have been useful! The culture of Wikipedia and GLAMs are obviously different: it was alluded to during the day. But it was a bit like the elephant in the room. Nothing I saw today made me think that those colleagues I mentioned would enjoy or even agree

to working alongside Wikipedians. Nick Poole showed that some GLAM people don't even think technology is a good way to communicate with audiences. These are who we're dealing with! I came away from this conference more confused: *how do I start thinking of this type of project? *how could I convince my colleagues? It seemed that the GLAMs and Wikipedians were speaking different languages and I don't know how to be the translator. I really liked Mia Ridge's talk: she highlighted that we GLAMs need our hands held, and there need to be 'concessions'/compromises on both sides. I need help to find our commonalities, but I don't think this conference helped. PLUS why were two introductory sessions on Saturday?! They should have been on Friday! and not clashing with other sessions. I'm still baffled who many of the speakers were talking to: to us GLAMs or to Wikipedians. It felt very biased towards Wikipedians, but surely without the GLAMs, GLAM-Wiki means nothing? It's simply Wikipedia as normal!"

"Avoid glossy paper handouts! Always print double sided! Don't waste the environment!"

"Make Sunday longer?"

"Official hotel closer to venue"

"Coffee all the time Better hotels and organisation before Transparency regarding who's coming"

"Better chairing/housekeeping?"

"Everything perfect, thanks! :)"

"You ask too many questions More discussion"

"Biscuits"

"Give more time to discussion"

"Let the participants know about extra social events a bit earlier :)"

"Add wiki username, where relevant, to all name tags"

"Keep on like that :))"

"Nothing"

"More time for communication, also may be round table to see people?"

"anything introductory - the first session on getting started at THATCamp was very helpful"

"MORE CONVERSATION"

Appendix 4: What sessions did you find least useful and why?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Engaging with maps - mostly about geo-referencing, would have been useful if it was broader in scope”

“Wiki toolset - not yet of use to me”

“Panel: Striking the balance - lacked focus”

“Where to start - too many panel members and long questions (not widen engagement)”

“Past partnerships UK - too crammed, too little discussion”

“Commons workshop - no computer room”

“Workshop 2 commons - should have been better prepared. Chaotic.”

“Toolset workshop - I am not technical”

“Edson's keynote”

“Wikidata - interesting but not workshop enough”

“Wikidata could have been presented more professionally”

“Wikidata introduction”

“Wikidata - over my head (oh well!)”

“Starting a project - a little confused”

“Wikimedia for GLAMs: Commons - structure wasn't geared towards GLAM professionals”

“Wikidata - didn't learn much new”

“Striking the balance (it was good but too hermetic for me - don't take it personally)”

“What are the risks by Fae. Very, very negative. Perhaps ok in informal discussion between Commons users in the pub, but exceptionally scary for GLAM professionals”

“Europeana”

“Wikidata background - would have been useful to talk about some of the issues around Wikidata - 'more a how to”

“Europeana - not yet of use to me”

“GLAM-Wiki toolset - not relevant to me”

“Final THATcamp (it didn't happen!)”

“Europeana toolset - too crammed too little discussion”

“Licensing - no negative examples”

“Geer Oskam - not really clear what the message/intention was”

“Striking the balance - not clear purpose and objective”

Appendix 6: Anything else you would like to add?

Below are the individual answers from the people who filled out feedback forms

“Very helpful - great intro for GLAMs. Excellent networking - loved the discussion”

“Fantastic weekend - taking away a lot of ideas - and great opportunity to make contacts”

“No”

“Visualising the info even better”

“Wikiacademy, Wikimania, WLM”

“1)Editing Wikipedia! 2)Gender gap project in NL”

“Thank you!”

“Learn how to edit Wikipedia :)”

“Very nice sandwiches!”

“No”

“Some presentations were so long with no time for questions and speakers were rushed off stage, which is not very nice.”

“Important event, thank you!”

“Just a brilliant experience”