

ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET Trainers Workshop 2013

Table of Contents

Minutes	3
Agenda topics	3
Welcome & introductions	3
Discussion	3
Conclusions.....	3
Action items.....	3
Person responsible.....	3
Deadline	3
ELIXIR-UK.....	3
Discussion	3
Conclusions.....	3
GOBLET	3
Discussion	3
Conclusions.....	3
First Group Activity	4
Discussion.....	4
Conclusions.....	4
ACTIVITY 1	4
Second Group Activity	8
Discussion	8
Conclusions.....	8
ACTIVITY 2.....	8
Dealing with some of the items then and there.....	9
Discussion.....	9
Conclusions.....	9
Action items.....	10
Person responsible.....	10
Deadline	10
Drop a thought: what we should tackle	10
Discussion.....	10
Successful training in the era of big data (+ some key questions).....	10
Discussion.....	10
Third Group Activity	11
Discussion.....	11
ACTIVITY 3.....	11
Tasks and names	15
Discussion.....	15
Conclusions.....	15
Action items.....	15
Coordinator (push taskforce)	15
those that put their name	15
ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET: brainstorming Implementation & future actions	17
Discussion.....	17

Next trainers workshop	17
Discussion.....	17
Conclusions.....	17
Action items.....	17
Person responsible.....	17
Deadline	17
Describe ONE WORD for “SERVICE”	17
Discussion.....	17
Action items.....	18
Person responsible.....	18
Deadline	18

MINUTES

MARCH 25 & 26, 2013

TGAC, NORWICH

Scientific Organisers	Vicky Schneider-Gricar (Vicky SG), Teresa Attwood, Chris Ponting, Carole Goble and Dawn Field
Invited speakers	Francis Ouellette, Susanna Sansone
Run& summarised by	Vicky Schneider-Gricar

Agenda topics

09:00-10:00

Welcome & introductions

VICKY SG & MARIO CACCAMO

DISCUSSION	Vicky SG welcomed all and explained a few expectations: ALL to refrain from e-mails, etc. until breaks, silence mobile phones and pro-actively interact.	
	Mario Caccamo formally welcomed all and provided a short introduction to The Genome Analysis Centre (TGAC), clarifying that TGAC does more than genome analysis. Mario also asked all participants to say in three words max: their name, affiliation and what they are...	
	Speed dating: all, led by the organising committee, holding hands, actively engaging and disclosing a secret!	
CONCLUSIONS	All engaged (but some disliked the whistle intensity used to keep the timing during the speed dating session).	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Review activity for future workshops: increase pace and find alternative 'buzzer'!	Vicky SG	May 2013

10:00-10:15

ELIXIR-UK

CAROLE GOBLE

DISCUSSION	Carole Goble gave a short presentation to explain what ELIXIR-UK is and how it fits within ELIXIR as a whole.
	Carole mentioned the request from BBSRC not to include postgraduate training (e.g., PhD programmes, Master programmes). All agreed that this should not preclude PhD students from attending courses/workshops. Carole emphasised the importance of efforts/activities that offer scalability (e.g., one-to-one tutoring vs MOOC).
CONCLUSIONS	Anyone who has questions and/or wants to explore how to get further involved in ELIXIR-UK, drop an e-mail to Carole.

10:15-10:30

GOBLET

TERESA ATTWOOD

DISCUSSION	Terri introduced the 'Global Organisation for Bioinformatics Learning, Education & Training', GOBLET, and its historical background, clarifying that GOBLET covers training and education , and spans beyond bioinformatics, also including, for example: computational biology, biocuration and biotechnology.
	Terri explained that GOBLET will work on a membership basis (from organisations to individuals) in order to be sustainable; details of how these will work will be finalised in the upcoming GOBLET meeting during ISMB 2013. Terri welcomed all organisations/Institutions to join by signing the MoU http://mygoblet.org/sites/default/files/files/GOBLETMoU23rdSignatory020413.pdf
CONCLUSIONS	Anyone who has questions and/or wants to explore how to get further involved in GOBLET, drop an e-mail to Terri.

DISCUSSION	<p>Participants segregated into three themes, forming a total of four groups: 2 on Bioinformatics & Biocuration (Champions: Teresa Attwood and Susanna Sansone), one on Computational Biology (Champion: Francis Ouellette), and a third one on Computing (Champion: Carole Goble) with Dawn Field floating across groups. Each group had to define a Chair and Rapporteur. All groups had to reflect on the following five questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the state-of-the-art in training in your theme? 2) What methods work in your theme? 3) How many people are being trained in your theme, and how many are there that need to be trained? 4) What are the training gaps/needs in your theme (based on sticky notes) and, 5) How do you perceive that ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET could help?
CONCLUSIONS	<p>Most participants chose bioinformatics & biocuration, and hence two groups were dedicated to this topic.</p>

ACTIVITY 1

ACTIVITY 1	Group 1: Bioinformatics & biocuration	Group 2: Bioinformatics & biocuration	Group 3: Computational Biology	Group 4: Computing
Defining their theme...	Bioinf 101		What is difference/ overlap between comp biol. and bioinformatics? Chemical biology other fields of sequence stuff. Informatics vs bioinformatics. Modelling and sysbio. Computational life sciences. Algorithms	
Q1 What is the state of the art in training in your theme?	Blended learning e-learning training + education → deep knowledge focused themes embedding → visits Openness Peer learning		State of art? Courses given by authorities.	5% vs 95% - if you go and ask a computer scientist you'll get an answer but you won't be able to make it work 'Consumers' – car driver who doesn't want to know how the engine works Computer scientists will write highly optimised code but not interested in usability

				<p>Software developers optimise for usability and documentation but hard to publish papers – no room for ‘here’s a thing – use it’ papers</p> <p>How can we make it more attractive for software developers to continue working on someone else’s code?</p>
<p>Q2 What methods work in your theme?</p>	<p>Blended learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Games • Face2face: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lectures Flip-classes Quizzes <p>E-learning vs online learning</p> <p>Exercises</p> <p>Discussions (small groups)</p>		<p>Tool-oriented training.</p> <p>Refreshers.</p> <p>Social engineer teams in class to mix bio and cs people.</p> <p>T shaped people.</p> <p>Use cases.</p> <p>Problem oriented.</p>	<p>Encouraging researchers to take some basic principles from good software engineering practice</p> <p>Need to train the new generation of researcher-developers</p> <p>Training projects driven from a research point of view, not just ‘I’m going to teach you programme X’</p> <p>Enabling others to use your stuff – documentation, testing, revision control, code clinics</p> <p>Sharing code can encourage best practice</p> <p>Benefits to the programmer – reusability, reproducibility</p> <p>Hiring the right guy for the right job: researcher-developer to do research; developer to turn it into a usable product</p>

<p>Q3 How many people are being trained in your theme, and how many need to be trained?</p>	<p>Many, even more</p>	<p>1000s (15k) <u>reach</u> to appropriate researchers/PIs accreditation or legislation as part of PhD programmes?</p>	<p>Need for training vs teaching. Industry needs shorter. Overview.</p>	<p>500 (worldwide) through software carpentry last year Lots of online forums Discoverability is hard There are the 'I know I should be doing this but life's too short' crew (5%) Then there are the 'I didn't even know that these tools / these practices existed' (the 95%)</p>
<p>Q4 what are the training gaps/needs in your theme (based on sticky notes)</p>	<p>Recognition: DOIs for materials Dissemination \$\$\$, funder lobbying Keeping with cutting-edge materials Training impact factors</p>	<p>Requirement for mentoring: long-term follow-up. Requirement for blended learning → life-long learning Funding for training Recognition in career structure for contribution to training Peer networking/support Bringing together core bioinformatics facilities Finding common language between researchers + bioinformaticians (also training computational expertise in biological skills) Using Cloud Amazon Web services: negotiate through government Link to ELIXIR infrastructure Distinction between 'in house' training for PhD students AND conferences/workshops/tutorials</p>	<p>Need oriented. Who should train? Other users? Developers? Broad training in computational life sciences. Size of black box? Importance of understanding information is inherent in biology. Tool selection. Tools in context. Scientist - technologist interaction help. Intensive training, broad. Responding to change. Can we train at the cutting edge? Can we train with older things that have better UX? Researcher oriented vs methods. Training in foundations of science for</p>	<p>Need to set up 'SWOT' teams that will create a supportive environment in which researcher-developers are... Encouraged to sit 1:1 with software developers – even for a short time Encouraged to make their code available (GIT-hub) Taught that software needs to live beyond the life of the project Need to provide basic training on what infrastructure is available and on risk assessment – could use the very latest thing but is it supported? Is there a community to help me? Not just about code – it's about data too: need to provide training on how to assess the quality of data</p>

		<p>ELIXIR/GOBLET representation of other biological meetings</p> <p>Mechanisms for recognition of training OR training material/development</p> <p>Recognition in acknowledgments/authorship for contribution to bioinformatics training</p>	<p>technology background people.</p> <p>Why are people still coming in from physical science?</p> <p>Collaboration skills.</p>	<p>resources – otherwise users become locked into ‘here today, gone tomorrow’ services</p> <p>Need to train a service mentality – by the time they get to postdoc level they’re already embedded in a research mentality</p> <p>Need to train the PIs to get away from the ‘publish or perish’ mentality for software development</p>
<p>Q5 how do you perceive ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET could help?</p>	<p>Help make above happen</p> <p>Coordination/dissemination</p> <p>QC</p> <p>Promotion of research standards</p>	<p>Accreditation</p> <p>Link use of data hub to requirements to train + TeSS training portal</p> <p>Database of experts ↔ link to BTN_or extend links</p> <p>Efficient use of existing resources (identify areas underrepresented).</p>	<p>Each node can contribute a field to pot.</p> <p>Index existing resources. Where to start? Join things up.</p> <p>Prerequisites.</p> <p>Gap analysis.</p> <p>Provider indexing.</p> <p>Funding source indexing.</p> <p>Facilitate consortium and collaboration formation.</p> <p>Community building.</p> <p>Hei industry interaction.</p> <p>Abandoned tools and dbs.</p> <p>Open content to avoid duplication/syndication.</p> <p>Build collaborations to avoid skills explosion.</p> <p>Embedding.</p> <p>Bringing people together, social engineering. Push X for Ys.</p> <p>Hackathon.</p>	<p>Lobbying on the importance of rewarding trainers and others in a service role</p> <p>Who provides accreditation? GOBLET as the professional body for this?</p> <p>Accreditation needs to capture experience – not just ‘I’ve done this course’</p> <p>Recognised software authoring –publishing papers isn’t the only means of recognition</p> <p>ELIXIR could foster collectivism – bring small labs together to work on big problems</p>

14:00-16:10

Second Group Activity

ALL

DISCUSSION	<p>Participants were sorted into three groups with respective Champions: Teresa Attwood/Susanna Sansone); Francis Ouellette and Carole Goble. Each group had to define a Chair and Rapporteur. All groups had to reflect on the following five questions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What do you most want to get out of a community of trainers? 2) What training materials are there/should we produce (top three)? 3) What do we not need to produce/re-create? 4) What resources are available to help improve your training? 5) What is missing/would you like to have to help improve your training? 6) How could ELIXIR-UK (TeSS) and GOBLET (portal) help?
CONCLUSIONS	<p>There was some confusion about TeSS: Susanna Sansone presented an overview of TeSS to provide clarification, extracting the information from the ELIXIR-UK node application (two summary figures to be added soon to the workshop website).</p>

ACTIVITY 2

ACTIVITY 2	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
1) What do you most want to get out of a community of trainers?	<p>1) Quality Control (QC) (QC) Guide to good stuff (QC) moderation of material</p> <p>2) Training the trainer (licensed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactive Web courses • Learning by doing • Open access • R top rated too/ video tutorials <p>3) Curriculum/core + customise</p>	<p>Sharing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best working practice • Delivery methods • Experience • Feedback • Data-sets good/bad • Training materials/resources • Expertise • Database footprint ppf • Searchable keywords to find trainers 	<p>e-forum expertise ←----→community Improvement skills Support of networks, other people Clear community, access point info CPD Tool & Problem (flexible) Tailored to needs Geographical location (local training)</p>
2) What training materials are there/should we produce (top three)?	<p>Demonstrators Peer Training Network Credit for demonstration Mentoring Insights into improving with feedback Gaps identified Best practice Successful methods Trust</p>	<p>Make it easy to find one we have already Use-case repository Preparing them for failure Pre-requisites/ flow of knowledge</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) e-learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • filming/videos: - lectures, -demos. • Wiki 2) screen cast: as standard operation procedure 3) slides and exercises
3) What do we not need to	<p>NGS courses→ increase discoverability</p>	<p>Everything (existing training materials)</p>	<p>X</p>

produce/re-create?	Databases Wiki's Platform for self promotion		
4) What resources are available to help improve your training?	Skype/interaction Social networks/communication Cloud computing	Training ←-----→ feedback Feedback during the course Watching how other trainers train 3 rd person feedback (peer reviewed)	Active community Targeted forums, blogs (specialised). Repositories of materials oncourse/bioconductor/release notes
5) What is missing/would you like to have to help improve your training?	*train the trainers* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops • Bootcamps • Hackathon Avatars/local demonstrators for virtual teaching		Train the trainers Quick start guide (10') Trainer community Clear on terms and conditions
6) How could ELIXIR-UK (TeSS) and GOBLET (portal) help?	Collect (long range + honest) feedback Pressure group: awards 4 teaching, <u>open</u> teaching golden tablet. Use existing: journal OPEN to training YouTube channel Careful about being measured to death – ref game.	Identifying training organisations that provide training (venues, rooms) Not reinventing the wheel, duplicating work Accreditation/endorsements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badges • Champions • Making training credible Standardised feedback system	Facilitate a network Interdisciplinary community Advice on CC Quality control Catalogue Professional accreditation Lobby for funds

16:10-15:30

Dealing with some of the items then and there

ALL

DISCUSSION	Participants were asked about options for the last session, including whether they felt there was any item from the previous session that could be tackled then and there.
	The discussion started by defining top items ALL wanted to discuss on a flipchart: 1) GOBLET's role and ELIXIR-UK role? (selected) 2) Who decides what is good or bad? (selected) 3) All fields vs specific (the entire range) (not selected) 4) Feedback, in particular long-term (not selected) 5) Semantics: we should clarify first among us a common terminology (e.g., what's "bioinformatics", what's "e-learning vs online learning, vs blended learning") (selected)
CONCLUSIONS	1) GOBLET's role <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOBLET could be the Professional Body for Bioinformatics Training: badges, accreditation, community gang! • Online aggregator! • Provides enabling technologies • Training award: the GOLDEN GOBLET, community vote. • Open courseware

	ELIXIR-UK role <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELIXIR-UK: provides the platform and coordinates enabling?! • Design models for training • Framework for node-to-node efforts • ELIXIR resources 	
<p>2) Who decides: after quite some discussion on this, where participants suggested: everyone, trainees, long-term feedback, evaluation of features, it became clear that there was confusion about whether the subject of the discussion was actually materials, courses or trainers. ALL decided to stop, with a common agreement that we should define MINIMUM INFORMATION MODEL OF COURSES (to allow them to be comparable), almost like a “compare the training.com”, including investigation of existing standards (e.g., SCORM was cited for e-learning; however, some participants underlined the difficulty of implementing such standards...and questioned whether they were fit for purpose). Regarding MIMCs, Manuel Corpas mentioned SASI, and its potential expansion and suitability as a model to achieve this.</p>		
<p>5) Attempts to gauge the type of terms that ALL felt needed disambiguation, definition, etc., provided the following list: workshop, standardisation, cloud, big data, course, service, infrastructure, software developer, life science informatics, clinical bioinformatics, health, computational life sciences, education, training, bootcamp, e-learning, online learning, blended learning, e-training,</p>		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Minimum information model for courses	Manuel Corpas + Rafael Jimenez + Vicky SG	May 2014
Create a tag list of terms + descriptions (start with those in this list) and engage with specific communities to create tailored lists (e.g., plants/crops, health/clinicians). Ontology and CVs.	Vicky SG + Susanna Sansone + Manuel Corpas + Rafael Jimenez	May 2014

09:00-09:15

Drop a thought: what we should tackle

ALL

DISCUSSION	<p>Participants were asked to write one item they would like to prioritise, work on, see covered before the end of the day. Overlaps and similar responses led to seven clear groups (from 45 post-its in total - some participants did not contribute):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Trainer support (incl. train-the-trainer), 5 post-its 2) Recognition of training, 3 post-its 3) Sharing, 5 post-its 4) Funding, 4 post-its 5) Future course needs/long-term feedback, 9 post-its 6) Curriculum/content/templates, 5 post-its 7) ELIXIR-UK & GOBLET: how will it work/redundancy, how can I get involved/stay informed?, 12 post-its <p>And two separate but important post-its said: “need for clear deliverables and actions” “who did we forget to invite to a workshop like this?”</p>	
09:15-10:00	<p>Successful training in the era of big data (+ some key questions)</p>	<p>FRANCIS OUELLETTE</p>
DISCUSSION	<p>Invited speaker, Francis Ouellette, addressed this title and some specific questions he'd received prior to the meeting; his presentation will be available soon from the workshop website.</p>	

DISCUSSION	<p>Participants were sorted into three themes with respective Champions: Susanna Sansone; Francis Ouellette and Carole Goble. Each group had to define a chair and rapporteur. All groups had to reflect and work on the following five common questions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What are the metrics for evaluating the success of training courses? 2) What are the metrics for evaluating trainers? 3) How could different activities be reported so that they're comparable? 4) What would you do with £1k for training? 5) How do you perceive that ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET could help?
-------------------	---

ACTIVITY 3

ACTIVITY 3	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
<p>1) What are the metrics for evaluating the success of training courses?</p>	<p>Feedback from students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forms • Collected opinion <p>DOI or some other tag to include in papers and CVs</p> <p>Ingredients necessary for long-term, testing before and after</p> <p>Networking?</p> <p>Grant applications mentioning training</p> <p>Material reusability</p> <p>Message: would you be available to answer...</p>	<p>WHY?</p> <p>Best practice for successful courses</p> <p>Best practice for evaluating success of courses</p> <p>Continuous improvement of course content and delivery</p> <p>To convince funders their investment is having an effect</p> <p>Evaluate consistently across courses to allow comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For funders • For trainers <p>HOW?</p> <p>Pre-course questionnaire</p> <p>During the course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One thing learned • Good/bad round up <p>Immediate post-course survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were expectations met? • Shape the next course. • Difficult to get beyond environmental problems (e.g., hot, cold). <p>Longer-term feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What activities did you do that you couldn't have done without the course? • Papers, grants, collaborations? <p>Issue: wide range of seniority: no immediate feedback on course.</p>	<p>Nr of people trained</p> <p>Nr trainee hours (new)</p> <p>Would you recommend this...? (attendees that come as a result)</p> <p>Are they using what you taught (6 months later), papers arising, collaborations arising from course</p> <p>Checking post-course use/visits of online tools/resources: e.g. spikes post course & who attended</p> <p>Online: return visits, Google analytics</p> <p>Assessments ("did they learn it?")</p> <p>Course itself vs impact of course</p> <p>Quantitative vs qualitative</p> <p>Monitoring and feedback during a course</p> <p>Paper forms vs online forms</p> <p>Pre-survey to pitch material at right level</p> <p>* ask the right questions in the right way *</p>

<p>2) What are the metrics for evaluating trainers?</p>	<p>Badges: trainers apply after each event.</p> <p>Standardised criteria</p> <p>Feedback forms from students</p> <p>Reports from trainers</p> <p>Peer review</p> <p>Test (measure exercises)</p>	<p>QUESTION</p> <p>Does a numerical metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g., 1-5 “goodness” have a value? • e.g., to evaluate trainers. • want direct comparisons and to act on them. <p>Who does post-course exams? (e.g., for accreditation/certificated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable for shorter courses. • Necessary for university equivalence? Do we want to fulfill this? • Does evaluation scare people? Inhibit innovation? New entrants? <p>Needs of funders and train-the-trainers are <u>different</u>.</p> <p>WHAT TO ASK?</p> <p>Did the student feel confident to do more?</p> <p>Did the student learn new things not directly related to course content? <i>E.g.</i>, connections, collaborating, practices.</p> <p>Did content match expectations of participants?</p> <p>Did delivery match expectations of participants?</p> <p>Balance between practical and theory</p> <p>How did you find out about a course?</p> <p>Did the trainers “understand the room”? (e.g., expertise of students, balance, syllabus).</p> <p>Did students feel enthused</p> <p>Did this represent a sea change</p> <p>Is content sufficient for trainee to be a trainer (e.g., useful as acceptance criteria for oversubscribed courses)</p>	<p>GOBLET: as Professional Institute: so how do they do it?</p> <p>Portfolio & tracking of personal development</p> <p>Look at how Unis do it and don’t adopt that approach</p> <p>Rate individual sessions/ questions on →tease out information about trainers via well chosen questions</p> <p>Peer review in a supportive way</p> <p>Difference between trainers in some group/organisation or contractors or volunteers</p> <p>Adoptability on the fly</p> <p>Who has done how much on what...open badges</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Would you recommend the course to others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What benefits do Heads of Department see? • If not, what would you need to change? <p>What other courses/topics do you want to see?</p>	
<p>3) How could different activities be reported so that they're comparable?</p>	<p>Standardised feedback forms</p> <p>Open materials (MM)</p> <p>Commonly agreed metrics</p> <p>Repository:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking metrics, materials • Standardised objectives <p>Announcements (rich) with good descriptions</p> <p>Categorised ranges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels • Tagged by subjects 	<p>What do we want to find out?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainers: delivery, trust, rapport • Content covered: appropriate? • Trust (recommendations)-improvement • Timing: rushed/comfortable? <p>Trainers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer observations of teaching (choose someone trusted to sit in and provide feedback) • Self-identification: are people coming to working like this? <p>Numbers: some numbers are private, some very public.</p> <p>Number of applicants: accepted, completed</p> <p>Keep a mailing list: best people to advertise are your alumni.</p> <p>Feedback on course content: creators as well as deliverers.</p>	<p>How to compare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training courses • 1-N consultancy knowledge exchange • 1-1 consultancy <p>and see the things that are different.</p> <p>Classify the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • location • types of training • levels • pre-requisite tests: who should not go on each course • resources/tools used <p>IT is NOT constructive to compare courses to each other! ("a better than b"). It's constructive to identify dependencies and pre-requisites</p> <p>It is more important to ensure attendees get to the courses they need</p>
<p>4) What would you do with £1k for training?</p>	<p>£1K</p> <p>Pay time to helpers to build automated forms to collect data</p> <p>Fellowships for valuable applicants with no funds</p> <p>Support 'training the trainer'</p> <p>Golden GOBLET (plated) TM</p> <p>£1M</p> <p>A way to pay to trainers</p> <p>Research on how to TRAIN</p>	<p>£1K</p> <p>Peer mentoring!</p> <p>Send people to observe other and publish feedback.</p>	<p>£1K</p> <p>Trainer/internship/scholarship</p> <p>Hackathon</p> <p>Trainer 'away day'</p> <p>20 hard drives with tools/OS, etc.</p> <p>Prizes for contributors</p> <p>Amazon-time</p> <p>Online resources</p> <p>Books for attendees</p>

	<p>better (learning research)</p> <p>Large-scale train-the-trainer</p> <p>Computing infrastructure (time on the Cloud)</p> <p>Set-up researchers in developing countries</p>		<p>Pay trainee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • revise course • polish slides <p>Buy time on GOBLET sequencer</p>
<p>5) How do you perceive that ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET could help?</p>	<p>Lobbying</p> <p>Raising awareness</p> <p>More recognition</p> <p>Train-the-trainer WS</p> <p>Workgroups to study standardisation</p> <p>Brainstorm on how to engage and proceed</p> <p>Community building</p> <p>Widening membership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual • Institutional <p>Annual meeting</p>	<p>Provide one standard minimal set of questions that you should ask pre- + post-course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow each course to supplement their own questions • To allow comparability across ELIXIR (GOBLET) • Best practice or “enforced” <p>Act as third-party administrators for post-course surveys?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be quick and easy • Be of value to trainers • Unbiased feedback • Long-term feedback • Suggestions of courses students might like <p>Look at over-arching strategic view from data collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are the gaps? • Where is the interest/buzz? • Persuade funder to provide funding in underprovided areas <p>Look at long-term impact on science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • And provide the info to funders, course organisers <p>Should GOBLET/ELIXIR-UK accredit trainers?</p> <p>Requires observation, “academy of trainers”</p>	<p>TELL someone to DO things!! (be FIRM)</p> <p>Drive the trainer classification</p> <p>Resource (Grid/Cloud/UPC) brokering for ELIXIR-UK members.</p> <p>With standards bundles/interJuces/VMS, etc.</p> <p>Hartree offer resources A/V for training- ELIXIR-UK can leverage things</p> <p>1-on-1 training match-making</p>

DISCUSSION	<p>Since the planned group activity had themes that all felt had been covered previously, everybody agreed to modify the programme to prioritise the tasks we ALL should tackle first.</p>	
	<p>Based on the “drop a thought: what we should tackle” session at the start of the day, the following seven categories were defined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Trainers support (incl. train-the-trainer), 5 post-its 2) Recognition of training, 3 post-its 3) Sharing, 5 post-its 4) Funding, 4 post-its 5) Future courses needs/long-term feedback, 9 post-its 6) Curriculum/content/templates, 5 post-its 7) ELIXIR-UK & GOBLET: how will it work/redundancy, how can I get involved/stay informed?, 12 post-its 	
CONCLUSIONS	<p>Terri and Carole provided each a further overview and clarification of GOBLET and ELIXIR-UK respectively. They particularly tackled questions relating to TeSS and GOBLET, and how one would fit with the other. The conclusion was that TeSS will function as an AGGREGATOR: it's a platform that depends on the Community for its contents and governance. Interlinked to it: yellow pages (registry of trainers); events calendar; material directory. The two figures Susanna used to explain TeSS will be available soon from the workshop website.</p> <p>ELIXIR-UK to GOBLET:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource to support platform (discuss the hosting), “GOLD sponsor” • Resource to sponsor necessary activities → minimum description. • Partner for content/events community (one of many) + review. Training partner! <p>ELIXIR-UK additionally to GOBLET:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brokering access to resources in ELIXIR and in UK (support with ELIXIR-UK institutions to enable follow-up training). • Lobbying. • Funding proposals/initiatives. • Roll-out of training approaches to ELIXIR. 	
ACTION ITEMS	COORDINATOR (PUSH TASKFORCE)	THOSE THAT PUT THEIR NAME
Trainer support (incl. train-the-trainer) Taskforce	Urmi Trivedi & Cath Brooksbank	Rick Dunn Mark Viant Sarah Morgan Rob Davey Tracey Timms-Wilson Johan Nylander Aidan Budd Gabriella Rustici Andrew Deverean Celia van der Gelder Patricia Palagi Angela Davies Eija Korpelainen
Recognition of Training Taskforce	Allegra Via & Aidan Budd	Mick Watson David Sims Pedro Fernandes Manuel Corpas Bert Overduin Celia van der Gelder Patricia Palagi Vicky SG

		Neil Chue Honk
Sharing Taskforce “OPEN”	Susanna Sansone & Vicky Schneider	Simon Andrews Katy Wolstencroft Martin Golebiewski Pedro Fernandes Patricia Palagi David P Judge Urmi Trivedi Dan Maclean Celia van der Gelder
Funding Taskforce	Patricia Palagi	Mick Watson Vicky SG Rick Dunn Mark Viant Carole Goble Celia van der Gelder
Future courses needs/long-term feedback Taskforce	Jacky Dreyer & Gabriella Rustici	Patricia Palagi Celia van der Gelder Mindi Sehra Andreas Heger Charis Cook Christine Orengo Angela Davies Eija Korpelainen
Curriculum/content/templates Taskforce	Pedro Fernandes Phil D Judge	Sumir Panji Sarah Morgan Ruth Lovering Rob Davey Jan Kim Gabriella Rustici Patricia Palagi Charis Cook
Outreach/Community engagement Taskforce	Aidan Budd	Celia van der Gelder Bert Overduin Tracey Timms-Wilson Manuel Corpas Vicky SG
TeSS (registry/database of training-relevant events/materials/catalogues). Help us designing, help us collect user prerequisites, etc.	Susanna Sansone & Terri Attwood	Tracey Timms-Wilson Sarah Butcher Rafael Jimenez Manuel Corpas Carole Goble Katy Wolstencroft Tim Booth Andrew Devereau
Data Carpentry (incl. biocuration, standards), launching a new initiative under ELIXIR-UK, do you want to be invited? Add your name	Susanna Sansone	Tracey Timms-Wilson Jan Kim Rob Davey Simon Andrews Sarah Butcher Katy Wolstercroft Vicky SG Martin Golebiewski Carole Goble Rafael Jlmemez Francis Ouellette Manuel Corpas

		Neil Chue Honk
--	--	-----------------------

15:30 -16:30 **ELIXIR-UK/GOBLET: brainstorming Implementation & future actions** PANEL

DISCUSSION	Front panel composed of Carole Goble, Chris Ponting, Teresa Attwood, Celia van Gelder, Allegra Via, Francis Ouellette, Susanna Sansone and Vicky Schneider addressed various aspects and questions from the participants.
-------------------	---

FUTURE MEETING **Next trainers workshop** ALL

DISCUSSION	All agreed it would be useful to have a follow-up meeting. This will be held at The Genome Analysis Centre (TGAC) in May 2014, if you are interest please send an e-mail to Helen Tunney.	
	Costs: we aim to cover similar costs as for this workshop: accommodation and food for all participants, travel for invited speakers and organisers. However details on this will be confirmed by latest May 2013.	
	One person as facilitator, note taker and time-keeper is quite stretching. Individuals who would like to take any of these roles are welcome. Please send an e-mail to Helen Tunney, indicating which role you would like to have to support the next meeting.	
CONCLUSIONS	In order to make the most of what we did during this meeting and see what we should change/add/remove for the next one, Vicky SG asked all to give one item about something they really liked on this workshop and something they would like to see different in the future.	
	<p>Top “I liked” items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Meeting people & networking 2) Interactivity 3) Learning about GOBLET 4) Learning about sharing challenges/training needs of others 5) Being open 6) Speed dating (and dinner quiz) 	
	<p>Top “in future it would be nice...” items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Have deeper, more specific/focused discussions 2) Have smaller break-out groups 3) Work there and then on the actions (e.g., case studies; standards and solutions) 4) See how all fits into a bigger-scale vision 5) Lightning talks from participants 6) Invite all to get involved in organising (e.g., contribute to agenda) 	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Volunteers to facilitate/time-keeping and note-taking for Workshop in 2014	Helen Tunney to remind all and capture volunteers for the roles.	February 2014
Circulate e-mail to catch items for agenda	Vicky SG	January 2014

RESPONSIBILITY+ CREATIVITY **Describe ONE WORD for “SERVICE”** ALL

DISCUSSION	Carole asked all to post one word to rename service as in: “professional research
-------------------	---

collaboration”, “expert collaborative support”, “research: engineer, technologist.”		
Data wrangler; bioinformatics consultancy, grown-up facilitator professional, advisor, profession, scientist, research support, innovation enabler, savior, lord and master, pillar foundational layer, councilors, provider consultant expert, platform, collaborative adviser, science provider, service is good! specialists, expert solution, expert consultant specialists, crafter, carpenter, resource expert, hero, interactomator, partner, professionalisation/industrialisation, indispensable support		
Most popular word on its own (combined): enabler-5 (6); advisor-3 (4); facilitator-3 (4), consultant-2 (4), expert 1 (4), support 1 (2)		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Carole to follow-up and share any conclusions from this activity	Carole Goble	May 2014