Think-pair-share on the CRITERIA for the entrance to the DLESE Broad Collection

Key: * = another person liked the idea
     N = another person did not like the idea
     [....] = another person made a comment on the idea

Heard while wandering:
We must develop a written definition of "Earth System Education." If we had such a
definition, it would make the existing criterion of "Relevant to Earth System Education,"
much more meaningful and toothy.

Broad or Community Collection Threshold Selection Criteria

- ***** Relevant to ESS Education [articulate]
- **** Well-documented ==> attribution
- *** Free of distracting and inappropriate or irrelevant advertising
- *** Works Technologically

Controversial = Scientific Accuracy; supported by research & references to research
literature  [accuracy or validity]
These need to be explained & supported with best practices or examples.

- ***** Annotation Service to direct people to information about biases, teaching tips,
opinions, discussion of value of the resource.

We need a Deaccession process NOW that is quick to respond to problems.
Other Selection Criteria--Guidelines to get there
    - uniqueness
Questions: Broad in subject scope; deep in each subject; [versus] only the best in a broad
range of topics
Tiered Approach

****** Simple policy offering positive guidelines for selection & collecting empowering inclusion rather than filtering [drop term "filter"]

(1) Fits DLESE Subject Scope (more precisely defined)
   - selective, not comprehensive
   - directly purposeful for ES science research or education
   - scientifically sound (omit?) outside of subject scope

(2) Basically works

Well-defined Priorities--where to focus our $$$ [yes]

**** (0) Audience-scope aligned with release cycle

** (1) Scientific Accuracy
   - citations
   * - Provenance is identifiable and reputable

**** (2) Purposeful for education of conduct of science
   - innovative pedagogy/active learning preferred

*** N (3) No to some kinds of advertising (pop-ups, exceeding % of page)
   - except unique or otherwise justified resource
   - this does not prohibit 'for fee' content

(4) Authority

Scope--Subject Boundaries

(5) Currency [?]

N (6) Persistence Plan

* (7) Quality of self-description [isn't this "well-documented"]

(8) Provenance [yes; but isn't this "well-documented"]
*** • New Collection of "submitted but not admitted" ["not admitted" doesn't mean proactively declined, it means something like not-yet admitted]
  - works in progress
  - Not DLESE Branded
  - Loose criteria
  - No time limit
  - Use basic filters (correct) Needs elaboration (e.g. definition of ESE relevance)
*
* • Mechanism for informal comments for any resource--differing from annotation [how differing]

***** • Area on the site for discussion or collaboration
  • Formal subject specialist review of resources

Criteria for DLESE Broad

N • Basic review by a subject specialist as a filter
*
* • Apply best practices -- moderately--and indicate which areas site achieves proficiency

**** • Bare minimum is scientific accuracy
• What does it mean to be a DLESE Resource?

****  (1) Reputation/brand-building phase

(2) Reputation maintenance phase

• Criteria for inclusion (priority)

***** • Revisit "favor" in scope statement

* • Supports DLESE reputation

• Favor [good term]:

**** • Scientific accuracy

**** • Integration of ESS (need articulation of ESSE relevance) [need to decide whether ESE or ESSE!!]

**** • Educational effectiveness (alignment with learning goals)

*** • Ease of use

**** • Exemplars as DLESE Resources

Allows for inclusion of materials (controversial) within proper framework. Still allows for resources to be "reviewed" by consistent DLESE criteria.
Wish List

** 1. There will be a part of DLESE for things under development. Discoverable on DLESE but not harvestable.
   - Meets comm plan
   - Provides commons
   - Provides way around sticky issues

* 2. Annotation framework exists. Teaching tips, comments

*** 3. We would have authority to change catalog & description based on DLESE framework, not on creator intent

N 4. A human-mediator (board) sits between "development" and "Broad"

----------------------------------
[here is drawing]
----------------------------------

Idea that didn't fit: Users can weigh the importance of ratings on 7 (?) axes of quality, (i.e. criteria). Does this apply to Rev. or Broad?

Needs to be transparent & immediately obvious where a resource fits. Click on Portal, special background on search.
Criteria for Broad Collection

****** 1. Relevant to ESE (Policy)
    - Articulated how?
    - More strictly applied to individual resources than items in collection (practice) [don't want to break up coherent body of knowledge]

**** 2. Technically Robust
    - No bugs, integrity (policy)
    - Navigation & accessibility (priority)

**** 3. Educationally appropriate (policy)
    - Pedagogy (priority, as per focus group)
    - audience (policy, as per focus group)
    - ease of use (as per focus group)

**** 4. Scientific validity (policy)
    - currency (priority)
    - accuracy of detail (priority)

=================================

Additional thought from Kim:

As we articulate priorities or things to be "favored" in gathering, we should favor gathering resources that fill gaps and thin spots of the Broad Collection that are within the DLESE Scope.