FCoP Scenarios for Software (Re)Use and Access - Arizona

Jan - Feb 2019

Table of Contents:

Timeline:

- ((January 7 - January 11) Brainstorm Scenarios for Use & Access
- (January 14 - January 25) Gather User Data
- (January 28 - February 1) Data Analysis and Preliminary Observations
- (February 4) Cohort Monthly Call - Scenarios for Use & Access Reports
-

Purpose:

The purposes of this exercise are to:
- Articulate potential software (re)use and access scenarios
- Inform/Verify your assumptions regarding (re)use and access scenarios by surveying a designated user

Instructions:

1. Complete 1-5 scenarios for use and access using the prompt below.
2. Identify 1-3 users whose use cases you believe may correspond with the scenarios for use and access that you articulated.
3. Ask participants to share 15-20 minutes of their time to reflect on their different needs related to software curation and preservation by completing the questionnaire.
4. Participants complete questionnaire

5. Analyze participant responses to determine the distance between your participant reflections and the scenarios for use and access driving your interest in software curation, preservation and emulation. Reflect on your findings.

Detailing your scenarios for use and access:

Actors	Goals	Resources	Challenges	Anecdotes for this use case
Type of stakeholder or user involved in the use case.	What does the actor want to do with software or software-dependent data?	What resources are available to this actor or these actors to achieve their goals - what resources do they need?	What challenges could your users face in attempting to accomplish their software reuse goals?	Any real world scenarios that you have witnessed or been involved in that informed your articulation of this use case.
LGIRA user (researcher) ● Carly Kocurek ● Ray Guins ● Jen Dewinter ● Ryan Moeller ● Jason Thompson	I'm interested in a studying a specific game (e.g., Rygar for Commodore 64)	Physical copy exists as does Commodore 64 hardware. Some non-software resources are already available for download as part of the collection.	Hardware works intermittently and can be difficult to operate. Or it could be unavailable (checked out). Emulating games in the browser may mitigate that challenge but the emulation user experience may suffer	Many cases of this in the LGIRA. Would like to provide reliable access
LGIRA staff ● Taylor Stephens ● Louis Magliozzi ● Tito Montero ● Kayo Shintaku ● Nick Leuenberger	Make backup/access copies of games and other material in the collection.	CD Rom drives, physical video game systems, kryoflux	Physical backups require blank media which may be difficult to find (e.g., cartridges). Emulated solutions could play a role but many systems do not have an emulator. Copy protections may hinder this effort, a workflow that allows this to happen does not exist	In fulfilling the LGIRA's "preservation through use" philosophy, it is inevitable that physical items will be damaged or misplaced.
Practitioner	Onboarding and	Documented	Copy protections,	

	training of new staff; practitioner wants to create their own software or game archive	policies and workflows; software, physical video game systems, emulated games	gathering video game systems & hardware for rendering (if physical lending is goal)	
● Molly Stothert-Mauer ● Stephen Hall ● Daniel Griffin ● Rolf Nohr ● Joanna Perez				

Survey Contacts

Name	Address
Carly A. Kocurek	ckocurek@iit.edu
Ray Guins	rgun81@gmail.com
Jen Dewinter	jdewinter@wpi.edu
Ryan Moeller	rylish.moeller@usu.edu
Jason Thompson	jthomp32@uwyo.edu
Taylor Stephens	taylorstephens@email.arizona.edu
Louis Magliozzi	lmigliaz@email.arizona.edu
Tito Montero	hm46@email.arizona.edu
Kayo Shintaku	kshintaku@email.arizona.edu
Nick Leuenberger	nleuenbe@email.arizona.edu
Molly Stothert-Mauer	stothert@email.arizona.edu
Stephen Hall	stephenhall@pharmacy.arizona.edu
Daniel Griffin	pastiche3@gmail.com
Rolf Nohr	r.nohr@hbk-bs.de

Revised Questionnaire Template:

**Scenarios for Use and Access Creator/Researcher Questionnaire
Qualtrics Survey:**

1. For what purpose(s) do you create/use/reuse game software for? Check all that apply.
   - ❏ To validate or test existing claims about particular games or game genres
   - ❏ To generate new research outcomes
   - ❏ To document or assist in the research process
   - ❏ To showcase the software as an historical artifact
   - ❏ To provide or recreate an experience
   - ❏ Other_____

2. What function(s) do you create/use/reuse game software for? Check all that apply.

   - ❏ Replication/reproducibility/validation of data/experiences
   - ❏ Research outcomes
   - ❏ Aggregation
   - ❏ Computation
   - ❏ Migration
   - ❏ Artifact
   - ❏ Other_____

3. What documentation should be collected related to how you create/use/reuse game software?

   - ❏ User manuals
   - ❏ Technical specs/requirements
   - ❏ Bugs/Testing Protocols
   - ❏ Correspondence
   - ❏ Promotional material
   - ❏ Publications
   - ❏ Other_____

4. For game software you have created/used/reused, what components do you consider as essential to retain?

   - ❏ Hardware / peripherals
   - ❏ Libraries
   - ❏ Programming languages
   - ❏ Source Code
   - ❏ Environments
   - ❏ Documentation

5. What were the storage media for the software you created/used/reused?

- ❏ Removable media (diskettes; CDs; USB drives)
- ❏ Firmware (e.g., EPROMs)
- ❏ Computer hard drives
- ❏ Hosted on website (GitHub; research group homepage; cloud storage)

6. Which institutional stakeholders are involved in how you create/use/reuse game software? Please check that all apply.

- ❏ Software developer
- ❏ Librarian
- ❏ Copyright officer
- ❏ Archivist
- ❏ Curator
- ❏ Research data manager
- ❏ Steward
- ❏ Publisher
- ❏ Deployer
- ❏ Other_____

7. On a scale of 1-5, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements, keeping in mind the game software you work or interact with in your day-to-day activities:

1 – Strongly disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neither agree or disagree 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly agree

___	It is important to me that the provenance of this software has been fully documented.

___	It is important to me that I will be able to access this software in the future.

___	 It is important to me that others can easily discover this software in the future.

___	It is important to me that I can replicate my previous experiences with this software in the future.

___	It is important to me that others can use this software in the future.

___	This software offers a unique experience.

___	I want research libraries to steward this software.

___	I am comfortable with the idea that this software may be updated or enhanced in the future.

Data Analysis and Discussion Questions:

<u>Internal Scenarios for Use and Access</u>
1. **As you were developing out more verbose scenarios for use and access, what types of internal questions arose?**
2. **Was it difficult to choose which user scenarios to articulate, or was it relatively simple? If difficult, what might make that process easier?**

3. **Did you have some existing source of user data to inform these scenarios, and if so, what are the sources of this data?**
4. **What was your thinking/criteria/basis for prioritization if you had numerous scenarios for use and access?**

Researcher/Creator Questionnaire
5. **Were you surprised by any of the questionnaire responses from your users?**
6. **Did you find any patterns across user responses?**
7. **What new questions did these responses raise for your team? What additional information do you want or need to know from your users in order to inform internal policies, requirements and workflows for software preservation and emulation?**