Agreement Number: 03HQAG0148

Organization:
   Ohio Department of Natural Resources-Division of Geological Survey
   4383 Fountain Square Drive
   Columbus, OH
   43224-1362
   http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/geosurvey/

   New Address (but same physical location)
   Ohio Department of Natural Resources
   Division of Geological Survey, C-1
   2045 Morse Road
   Columbus, OH
   43229-6693

Project Leader
   James McDonald
   614-265-6601
   614-447-1918
   jim.mcdonald@dnr.state.oh.us

1. **Number of Metadata files created as a result of this project:** 662.
   Comments: We had originally proposed to create 55 files as part of this project.
2. **Clearinghouse Service**
   Is the metadata resulting from this project being served at a Clearinghouse site where it can be discovered and accessed? Yes. Selected data will be loaded onto a Clearinghouse site in the near future.

   What is the Clearinghouse address:
   http://metadataexplorer.gis.state.oh.us/metadataexplorer/explorer.jsp

3. **For projects who received training assistance:**
   Number of individuals that received training: 31
   Is metadata documentation and creation a part of your organizations workflow? Describe: Yes. Metadata documentation is part of our workflow. Metadata is created when a GIS project is completed and before any of the data is distributed to outside organizations or individuals.

4. N/A

5. N/A

6. **Project Narrative (no more than 120 words):**
   Summarize the project activities. Include its accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and next steps. What areas need work?

This project provided metadata training for 31 persons (21 from the Division of Geological Survey, 7 from five other state agencies, and 3 students from the Ohio State University) and produced 662 metafiles to date. The strengths of the project include the number of files that have been created and the establishment of a division policy that all GIS layers will not be distributed to outside agencies or the public without metadata. Weaknesses of the project include the inability to identify advanced metadata training for advanced GIS staff members, and the reluctance of some staff to create minimal metadata at the beginning and during the course of a mapping project. Metadata currently is only created at the end of a project. As a consequence of this project, the division intends to create a basic metadata course, or obtain basic 1-day metadata training, for new interns and possibly new staff members.

7. **Feedback on Don't Duck Metadata Program:**

One of the strengths of the Don't Duck Metadata Program is the resultant ability for the Ohio Division of Geological Survey staff to create metadata for GIS data sets and mapping projects. Unfortunately, the division has many outside-funded projects that do not include funding for data documentation. The primary weakness was the inability to identify advanced metadata training classes that would meet the needs of staff with advanced GIS proficiency. Another weakness was an inability to identify a training course that emphasized development of metadata for geological datasets. Most of the training classes that were identified cover the Biological Profile or focus on GIS subject areas not related to natural resources or geology. In addition, the instructors that were identified did not have training schedules that were convenient to the Ohio Division of Geological Survey

The program has positively impacted the Ohio Division of Geological Survey by enabling it to create metadata and perform data documentation on its internally funded GIS data sets and mapping projects.

The assistance that we received from this project was sufficient for our basic metadata-training efforts.

As a result of this project, I would recommend that other agencies not rely on FGDC for basic metadata training. I was somewhat surprised at the lack of support for metadata training from the FGDC.

The one factor that was missing from the program is formal training support.

The one program-management concern that I have is the slowness of the FGDC CAP program to respond to requests and project-management timelines. For example, the interim report was due at the beginning of January 2004 but the FGDC did not announce that the website for submitting the interim reports was available until April 19, 2004. A second example involves our request for training. We had made the request from the FGDC sometime in December 2003 for staff metadata training. We

never heard anything about the availability of training from the FGDC. A final example concerns the contract extension and contract modification. We had requested a contract extension and modification on June 23, 2004. We still have not seen the written contract as of January 14, 2004, even though we had received word that the contract was in the mail as of August 13, 2004.