

# Responses to Feedback on the ARDC HASS and Indigenous RDC Co-Design Process

13/05/2024

Following a recent grant of \$25 million from the Australian Government's 2023 National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS) funding round, ARDC has been working with the research community to co-design digital research infrastructure for the HASS and Indigenous Research data Commons.

In early 2024, we began to co-design infrastructure in an initial four focus areas. Two aimed to continue the work of the Improving Indigenous Research Capabilities and Language Data Commons of Australia activities, and two were new focus areas: the Creative Arts and Media(ted) Data (publicly available social media data). Following the process described in the [HASS and Indigenous Research Data Commons Co-Design Framework](#), we held public workshops for each focus area to understand researcher needs, desired outcomes, and requirements for potential solutions.

Following the workshops the project teams created draft project plans that were released on the ARDC website for further feedback. Alongside feedback on the project plans, we also received some feedback on the co-design process itself. We have responded to that feedback below, and where possible are implementing or will implement suggested changes to improve future co-design processes.

We received feedback on the co-design process from three sources. Each theme in the feedback is summarised and responded to below, with the source of that theme indicated as R1-R3.

**(R1) Co-design workshops give good insight to user needs, build stakeholder engagement, and increase the relevance and impact of the infrastructure. The workshops also build connections between stakeholders.**

We hope that these aspects of the co-design process will maximise the benefit achieved by the infrastructure we develop.

**(R1) Workshops have attracted diverse participation - but consider possible gaps in representation. Increase diversity of representation in workshops through actively reaching out to underrepresented groups.**

- We agree that actively working to identify and include underrepresented groups in future workshops is important - targeted outreach is an excellent suggestion for future co-design.

**(R1, R2) Consider more robust methods for collecting feedback from participants (focus groups, interviews). Current format (Miro whiteboard activities in Zoom breakout rooms) is focused on capturing written feedback at the expense of discussion - why not do this in an asynchronous survey?**

- We chose the workshop format of using Miro whiteboard activities in a live session to allow large numbers of participants to contribute their input and to see and respond to the comments of others in real time. We preferred this approach to using only an asynchronous survey, which does not allow any interaction between participants. After each workshop we shared an email address that participants could use to give additional feedback.
- With the numbers of participants attending the sessions, we cannot collect input through discussion alone, as it would not be possible to ensure all participants are heard. We will structure future workshops to allow more time for discussion between participants where possible, while also ensuring that all participants have time to provide their thoughts in writing.
- Unfortunately due to time constraints we have not been able to use more time-consuming methods of collecting feedback such as focus groups and interviews.
- Based on experiences in these first workshops, we have incorporated post-workshop surveys in more recent co-design processes to allow participants the time to give more detailed feedback.

**(R1, R2) Virtual workshops present accessibility barriers to participants with disabilities or limited digital access (particularly regarding the Miro whiteboard tool).**

- Holding workshops virtually allows us to maximise accessibility for geographically dispersed stakeholders and lower the time and effort required for attendance.
- However, we do note that online tools may present accessibility challenges (for instance, the Miro whiteboard tool is inaccessible to participants using screen readers). We attempted to mitigate this using a breakout room structure for these activities so that all participants had access to a breakout facilitator in a small group format who could attend to access problems and record responses on their behalf where needed.

- In future we will run post-workshop surveys wherever possible to offer a more accessible alternative for participants who cannot use Miro.
- In our more recent workshops we emailed ahead to inform registrants about the platforms that will be used - in future we will improve on this by explicitly asking registrants to let us know of any accessibility concerns they have prior to the workshop so that we can put alternative arrangements in place.

**(R3) The language used was not always understandable to all participants (i.e. technical jargon unfamiliar to artist practitioners)**

- The workshop included a varied audience combining technical infrastructure providers, researchers, and other stakeholders. We recognise that this made it difficult to communicate information in a way that would be both useful and understandable to all participants.
- Where possible, in future co-design processes we will seek to separate participants with different needs and experiences so that information can be expressed in a way that is most appropriate for that audience.
- Where a session must include participants with varied backgrounds, we will ensure that all presenters are aware of this and express themselves in a way that is more likely to be understood by all.

**(R1) Use a more iterative approach to co-design process with more feedback and refinement throughout project**

- The timeframes for this stage of the co-design process have constrained the number of workshops and feedback stages that we have been able to incorporate prior to the development of project plans. However, it is of utmost importance that the infrastructure that we develop meets community needs. For this reason, all projects have been designed with further co-design, feedback and refinement stages built into the project plan, including definition of user needs at the start of many work packages and major co-design and review stages half-way through the project.

**(R1) Ensure transparent and robust methods for incorporating input and feedback into project planning**

- We agree that it is extremely important that all feedback received during co-design is recorded, considered and incorporated into the project planning. We also agree that it is important that participants can clearly see how their feedback was taken into account.
- All responses received during co-design were analysed to identify key themes discussed in the main text of the co-design report, and the full text of all responses is recorded in the report's appendix so that it is clear exactly what was said by participants.
- Co-design sessions have been designed to allow and transparently communicate the incorporation of participant feedback into the planning process. In the first co-design workshop, participants identified the outcomes that they wanted the project to achieve. The ARDC identified the common needs expressed in this workshop, and in the second workshop the project team laid out a range of possible solutions to address these needs. Participants in the second workshop gave feedback on these solutions and any requirements they would have for them.
- The co-design reports were published alongside the draft project plans, so that participants could give further feedback on how well the planned work would meet their needs. Project teams considered the feedback before finalising their project plans, and will write a statement responding to the feedback and outlining how (if possible) the feedback was incorporated into the final plan or will be used to shape the delivery of the work.
- We hope that these processes give participants sufficient confidence that their needs and input have been genuinely heard, considered and integrated into the planned projects.