

**MEETING OF THE NHERI USER FORUM COMMITTEE**  
**August 9, 2022, 11am Central**

**MINUTES (by Wei Song)**

**In Attendance:** Stephanie Pilkington, Stephanie Paal, Wei, Antonio, Liesel, David, Claudia, Shane, Tori, Maggie, Yazen

**1. Approval of meeting minutes from the July 12, 2022 meeting**

Stephanie Paal made a motion to approve the minutes: Wei seconds; no objections.

**2. Travel Reimbursement for SI Trip**

Stephanie Paal: I have submitted a form but have not heard anything since.

Wei: I have signed a DocuSign document online and sent all the receipts to them about a couple of weeks ago.

Stephanie Paal: I sent all the receipts and a form and DocuSigned that form, but I have not heard back from them.

Stephanie Pilkington: If you still have not heard back from them in the next couple of weeks, please let Mohammad, me, or Wei know to follow up.

Antonio: Also, please let David and me know so that we can help to speed things up.

**3. Report from User Satisfaction Survey committee**

Maggie: Happy to see everyone and it has been a long time. I have two separate updates for you. First is the overview of the module data “Big Four”. The results presented here is from designsafe. The UF Satisfaction survey was integrated into DesignSafe’s Annual Survey Initiative in 2021, it was sent to 1810 users who has logged on to DesignSafe in the past year and a total of 181 responses were collected. Feedback mostly aligns with the previous module data received from experimental facilities (EFs). Sharing the data analysis results from the survey results from July. A total of 181 responses to the Big Four were collected. Data were shared in May 2022. One distinctive item is that most responses have indicated they have not reviewed NHERI Science Plan—this result is opposite to what we have received from the EFs. Another items worth attention is that, in question regarding if one would like to write future proposals using NHERI facilities, although more than half

indicate that they are willing to do so, a large chunk (28.7%) indicated that they are unsure.

Antonio: Our response rate compare to the other response rate. This is also opposite to what we have seen from EF surveys.

Antonio: I know DesignSafe sent the survey out, and do you know how is their response rate compared to our response rate?

Lisel: The two response rates should be the same, because our survey is integrated into DesignSafe's Annual Survey.

Antonio: Yes, but I just would like to confirm if there are responses answered to their questions but not to ours or vice versa.

David: The other thing that I would like to find out is who are the 10% respond to the surveys. How frequently are the ones respond to the surveys using DesignSafe?

Maggie: I can follow up with DesignSafe on these questions.

Lisel: The demographics associated with the respondents would be helpful too.

Claudia: In that respect, I am also one of the respondents, but because I am not in the US, I cannot write proposals to use the facility. Maybe the survey can use demographic information for more informative analysis.

Maggie: The annual user satisfaction survey is still open and it is a large effort that this group is undertaking. It contains 28 questions to collect both qualitative and quantitative data and it includes the big four and demographic questions. It was launched on June 9. So far we have 36 responses and the last survey collected is from June 27.

Stephanie Pilkington: If that is still live, do you want me to push it again?

Maggie: Comparing to past years (since I joined in 2019), this time we receive much lower response rate. (2018 n=69; 2019 n=29 for known users and 47 for general; 2020 n=57; 2021 n=66, and 2022 n=36 and 206 (for survey module) so far.

Lisel: I suggest to do another push and wrap it up at the end of this month.

Wei: Could it be the timing—the time when the survey sent out was during summer break when lots of people are on vacation? Were the past surveys conducted during the same period of time?

Maggie: Yes, the timing is similar. We usually start the surveys in the summer and close to July. The reason(s) that I can think of is, this group (UF) has pushed two initiatives in collecting data; and this time we also used social media platforms to push for the survey

versus via emails in the past. I can wait a little bit longer on the survey results and I can also discuss further with Mohammad about doing email messages again.

Antonio: When this survey effort started, we have looked into timing and making sure it is not overlapped with other surveys that NHERI or designsafe were doing. Although I am not sure what would change if we move the survey time to regular semesters, I think the important issue is how UF make use of the valuable data that is collected via the survey modules. A future discussion should be made to evaluate the effectiveness of the survey.

Maggie: yes, we plan to have a discussion this Fall to determine future plans for the survey based on the data we have received.

Lisel: can you explain the difference between the n=181 and n=206 for this year's total survey results.

Maggie: the n=206 is the total responses of combining designsafe and EF surveys. The earlier number of n=181 was just from designsafe.

#### **4. Report from NCO representatives**

Antonio: We have not met in July. Our next meeting is on Sep. 9 at 3pm.

#### **5. Report from ECO representatives**

Stephanie Paal: We are also having a break and have not had a meeting yet.

#### **6. Report from Facilities Scheduling representatives**

Claudia: we are the same. Our meeting was postponed to September.

#### **7. Report from Technology Transfer representatives**

Shane: we are the same. Nothing to report.

Yazen: Submit a report about the SI to TTC. Maybe that report can also be shared with UF so that everyone is aware of the TTC's plan for the future.

## **8. Updates on Communication and Outreach subcommittee**

Stephanie Pilkington: We started a new campaign. Once a week we tweet out something on the account, regarding something happening at the facilities and research highlights. We have a nice hashtag with it which I will share to everyone. Each week, among four different accounts, one of us will tweet out something. We will keep this pace until the end of the year and see how that goes. By the end of this year, once you click that hashtag then you will see the summary and highlights that have been achieved by these facilities.

## **9. Discussion on new member election**

### **i) New member election**

Stephanie Pilkington: we discussed this item last item. And one member will be coming from coastal engineering area.

Antonio: Also, to have someone to strengthening the communication subcommittee to help with social media. And a student member from graduate student council.

Stephanie Pilkington: In total, we are thinking to have two new members and one student member.

Stephanie Paal: I know our discussion last time has indicated about coastal engineering as one of the potential areas but how about wildfire?

Stephanie Pilkington: that is a good one. I do not think we have anyone here cover wildfire.

Antonio: This is something newly mentioned in science plan and also the new description in the NSF program.

Wei: The update on my side is that, Mohammad would start the process of initiating advertisement/announcement for nominations of new members. Right now, I do not think we have made any progress on that. I need to check further with Mohammad regarding this item. I am also going to bring the information/discussions mentioned here to Mohammad, especially focusing on the areas that this group does not have a coverage yet. Then, we will come up with these announcement messages and share them with UF next time.

Stephanie Pilkington: I would suggest that we have descriptions on the need of a coastal

person and a wildfire person, with the interest in using social media platforms. So, we still have two open election positions, but we can blend in the need of social media outreach in there and make sure the potential candidates can be aware of the needs in helping with the social media outreach.

Antonio: These things always work out better with nominations because people know who can better fit the positions and needs that we have.

ii) Student member from graduate student council

Antonio: what about the student member? If this member does not vote, then I assume this position can be appointed. How do you want to approach that?

Stephanie Pilkington: I would like to double check with Mohammad on that. But what I think is we work with graduate student council, asking for someone could be on both committees as a liaison member. I do not think we need to elect a person.

Claudia: Maybe the graduate student council can have their own nomination process and see who is the appropriate choice.

Antonio: Maybe that could be someone who is interested in social sciences.

Stephanie Paal: Last time we did talk about that one of the new younger members can help with the more recent platforms, such as TikTok or Instagram.

## **10. Others**

No further discussion.

The action items below were from past meetings and still need to be addressed.

**Action item:** To every UF member, please think about how to proceed with the ideas that we brought up before, which can help UF to move into next year.

**(Idea #1)** of hosting office hours with site representatives.

**(Idea #2)** that to host Happy Hours with previous users and talk about their experiences in an informal but interactive way.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:46 pm CT.