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Collaborative Strategic Planning: A Wiki Application

Introduction

For the past several years, wikis have been heralded as the information management solution for a number of organizational activities. While a review of the literature reveals much anecdotal support for wiki development and usage in the workplace, few studies have conducted systematic exploration and analysis to determine whether wikis are effective tools under particular purposes. Many questions, therefore, remain unanswered. What promotes organizational use after these tools are developed? Are wikis really appropriate for specific projects? Do they serve the needs of those who use them? Or, are they even used? Through the use of a survey instrument, this case study examines the use and usefulness of a wiki by library employees during the strategic planning process at San José State University. Specifically this study seeks to answer the following questions:

- Did employees use the strategic planning wiki?
- Did they find the wiki useful for communicating and documenting?
- What features of the wiki did employees use?
- What features did employees find especially useful or troublesome?
- Did training offered on Web 2.0 technologies influence wiki use?

In investigating these questions, the authors aim to contribute to the emerging literature on wiki usage for organizational development. In addition, the survey instrument serves as an assessment tool transferable to other organizational studies.

Background

The Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library is one of the first libraries in the nation to be funded, managed and operated jointly by a city public library system (San José Public
Library - SJPL) and a major university (San José State University - SJSU). This partnership involves complex planning and alignment of strategic directions to ensure the mission and objectives of both institutions are coordinated and fulfilled. While much joint planning has led to the success of the library, individual assessment and planning for each institution is an important step in maintaining the vitality of the partnership.

As the university had begun a campus-wide strategic planning process, the new dean of the university library, Ruth Kifer, initiated a library strategic planning project to clarify and develop future academic directions in this unique collaborative environment. Maureen Sullivan, a highly respected consultant, was invited to facilitate the planning process.

Under Sullivan’s guidance, interested academic library personnel used appreciative inquiry techniques to acknowledge successful practices, value human assets, and reaffirm innovative commitments. The sessions generated an abundance of information and ideas. A steering committee was then formed to guide the planning process. Later, five task forces were established to research best practices and gather supporting information for the purpose of clarifying organizational directions.

Using the library intranet as a communication tool, the steering committee established a strategic planning site to post meetings, schedules, action items and appropriate bibliographic resources. Posting materials to this site required committee members to submit content to the library web team. This proved to be a time-consuming process. It also lacked immediacy. The web team also filtered content for final approval. Therefore, the intranet did not act as a true repository for all documents and content generated by the committee. This traditional channel inhibited group dialogue. It
prevented brainstorming. Consequently, the committee sought a new tool to provide immediate posting capability for group generated documents, team calendars, and other essential information resources. This would enable easy communication among steering committee members and task force members alike.

Concurrently, as the University Library was launching its strategic planning efforts, an ad hoc team in the library charged with exploring new technologies was implementing an adaptation of the Learning 2.0 program to explore the promise of Web 2.0 technologies such as tagging, blogs, wikis, and RSS feeds. As a result of participating in the Learning 2.0 program, the strategic planning steering committee was increasingly comfortable with these tools and eager to investigate their usefulness as improved collaboration tools.

The committee determined that the wiki’s informal, community-building capability was particularly appropriate for the group’s information and communication needs. Unlike the mediated intranet environment, a wiki offered a collective space for brainstorming. Team members had the ability to add or edit page content and each iteration was archived. Additionally, the wiki provided useful blog-like features. Participants could choose to receive alerts of changes made to the wiki through RSS feeds or email. Also, a wiki offered users the option of leaving comments that typically mimic the temporal design of blogs. In SJSU’s case, the wiki was ultimately chosen because steering committee members anticipated that it could create a more dynamic, online work space, one that would allow staff to communicate and manage information throughout the strategic planning process. The follow sections highlight planning
concepts as a prelude to presenting findings on the efficacy of wiki technology to library organizational development.

**Literature review**

*Strategic Planning as a Collaborative Process*

Planning, in general, is recognized as an essential component to the success of an organization. According to the *Dictionary for Library and Information Science*, strategic planning is defined as follows:

The systematic process by which a company, organization, or institution (or one of its units) formulates achievable policy objectives for future growth and development over a period of years, based on its mission and goals and on a realistic assessment of the resources, human and material, available to implement the plan⁴.

Dougherty defines another aspect of strategic planning by differentiating it with long-range planning models of the past that were implemented when the rate of environmental change was slow and more predictable⁴. He describes strategic planning as an approach that incorporates more flexibility in a now rapidly changing environment, especially in terms of technology. While there are many philosophies and approaches to strategically positioning an organization for the future, a constant throughout the literature is the need for employee endorsement of the final plan in order to ensure its full realization.

In 1994, Birdsall and Hensley propose a model of strategic planning based on the assumption that people who share motivational interests can agree upon goals for successful change to that end. In particular, the authors note “If long term success is to be realized, it is critical that awareness, advocacy, and acceptance of needed change involve…major constituencies.”⁵ These major constituencies clearly include internal...
stakeholders, whose support is critically important to successful implementation of strategic and tactical priorities.

In a separate publication three years later, Birdsall outlines a political approach to the strategic planning process acknowledging the need for internal endorsement. He claims that by understanding the political climate of an organization, administrators are better able to tap stakeholder interests, form partnerships, and market strategic directives. In particular, he notes that “[s]trategic planning works best when the richness of stakeholder diversity is recognized and techniques are used to encourage full participation in the planning process.”

In his book, *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*, Bryson recommends a 10-step planning process which he refers to as the Strategy Change Cycle. He describes his model as inductive, rather than deductive or rational, which is based on the premise of conflict during the planning process. He proposes that as conflicts are addressed and resolved, a rational level is achieved politically among stakeholders. By assuming the presence of conflict as part of the planning process, Bryson recognizes the need for broad input. He emphasizes that “[i]n order to secure passage of any strategy or plan, it is necessary to continue to pay attention to the goals, concerns, and interests of all key internal and external stakeholders.”

Matthews describes how force field analysis can be used during the implementation phase of strategic planning to build an understanding of the different beliefs and expectations, or *forces* that will promote or discourage change. He outlines five steps to this process including defining the problem, brainstorming positive and negative forces, reviewing and clarifying each force, assessing hindering forces, and
developing an action plan. In particular, he makes note of meaningful participation that “all staff members should feel that their concerns and issues will be heard and addressed in a meaningful way.”

Dougherty emphasizes whole-scale change planning techniques that focus an organization on key changes only, thus speeding up the process. This type of planning seeks to avoid over-commitment and eventual fatigue or failure to attain organizational goals. He notes “[w]hat I like best about these change technologies…is that they are based on the premise that there is systematic staff participation in the planning process.”

Considering the aforementioned philosophies, a number of authors describe approaches to strategic planning at their respective organizations. Again, while the techniques differed, internal input was an important part of the process for each.

Shoaf details the planning that took place at Brown University in 1997. A Strategic Planning Steering Committee was convened. The committee developed broad directives and solicited input from staff to develop more specific goals. He emphasizes that “[s]trategic planning is a process in which the building of objectives is a key cooperative effort, where all staff are engaged so that consensus and commitment to the plan become corollaries to its implementation.”

McClamroch, Byrd, and Sowell discuss the strategic planning process at Indiana University Bloomington Libraries. Recognizing the inherent struggle for power within organizations, they applied Bryson’s Strategy Change Cycle to strive for political equilibrium during the decision-making process. They point out that the Strategic Planning Steering committee was comprised of staff from different service points in the
library, and that throughout, “there was a commitment to share valid information with all staff.”

Additionally, Vaughn writes about how the American Association of School Librarians board members embarked on a strategic planning process during January, 2004. Understanding the need for collaborative input, informal forums were held across the country to gather member input. Further, a draft of the strategic plan was also made available for member review.

All of these theoretical constructs and applied examples underscore the importance of broad-based input in the strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee anticipated that a wiki could help foster such an environment given its reputation as a community-building tool. However, the authors decided to explore this through more formal means as much of the literature on wiki application provides anecdotal feedback rather than data gathering techniques to determine the use and usefulness of the tool.

Wiki: A Closer Examination

Most articles about wikis list their basic features, compare various wiki engines and software, and differentiate them from other web 2.0 technologies. Schwartz, Clark, Cossarin, and Rudolph cover this content as it relates to educational wikis. Mattison examines these topics and provides examples of wiki use in library and information management contexts, as do Chawner and Lewis.

In addition to typical features and product comparisons, some authors emphasize a consideration of external factors as part of the selection process. Wagner analyzes wikis, blogs, and discussion forums for appropriate use. Fichter broadens her comparison to
include intranets, portals, groupware, and instant messaging\textsuperscript{17}. Both stress the importance of understanding the cultural and technical infrastructure of the work environment before choosing a tool.

Other authors describe their experiences developing and implementing wikis for specific educational purposes. Achterman, a library media teacher at San Benito High School, coordinated with an English instructor to build a wiki that facilitated student collaboration on a particular writing assignment\textsuperscript{18}. Withers discusses the benefits of an information desk wiki at Miami University Libraries noting it does not require a “gatekeeper” and is accessible to staff regardless of location\textsuperscript{19}. Allan recounts a library instruction wiki in Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University\textsuperscript{20}. The wiki enables students to share information, explore concepts learned during instruction, and further acts as a centralized tool for sharing resources. Matthies, Helmke, and Slater describe a successful collaboration between Butler Libraries business liaisons and the business faculty using a wiki to support course learning objectives\textsuperscript{21}. Ultimately, while these appear to be successful applications of the wiki, a closer examination of if and how wikis are actually used would reveal a more accurate picture of their value.

Usage statistics offer some insight into the utility of a wiki. The Library Success wiki was developed by Meredith Farkas to document library best practices\textsuperscript{22}. Since its inception in 2005, the wiki has recorded 1,761,230 page views. Chad Boeninger of Ohio University Libraries designed Biz Wiki to assist business researchers\textsuperscript{23}. He notes the main page of the wiki has received over 74,356 hits since the summer of 2005. Clearly, these wikis have been used, which suggests information of interest is being provided. However, while page hits are indicative of interest, it is often difficult to tell who is using
At San José State University Library, a survey instrument was developed to ascertain the specific value of the strategic planning wiki. Since the wiki was designed for internal purposes, the authors were easily able to query library task force members concerning their detailed use and perceptions of the tool. Through the use of a survey questionnaire, the authors were also able to assess more accurately the use and usefulness of a broad range of wiki features and capabilities.

**Methodology**

*Choosing a Wiki*

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee chose PBWiki, a free wiki engine, ([http://pbwiki.com](http://pbwiki.com)) that the Learning 2.0 committee had previously selected for one of the exercises\(^\text{24}\). Additionally, PBWiki claims to be an easy program to use, like making a peanut butter sandwich. A combination of familiarity with this tool, its ease of use, and free access made PBWiki an attractive choice. After selecting a wiki engine, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee started the wiki with blank pages for the different task force groups to further develop. [See Appendix 1]

*Survey Instrument Design*

The survey was designed to be completed within a ten minute time frame. The survey contained questions on individual background information, internet and Learning 2.0 experience, and use of various features of the strategic planning wiki. Whenever possible, questions contained space for additional comments for participants to expand on...
their choices. Two open-ended questions were added to the survey to elicit further qualitative information.

Participants were asked about their age, education background, and role in the library. A five-point Likert scale was used for questions concerning internet competence. If they indicated participating in the Learning 2.0 program, they were further asked to what extent. Participants were also asked about their use of wikis prior to and since the conclusion of the Learning 2.0 program. In addition, they were asked to identify tasks they performed on the wiki and then indicate ease of use. A five-point Likert scale was used for questions concerning the ease of use of particular features on the strategic planning wiki. [See Appendix 2]

Pilot Study

The survey questionnaire was pilot tested prior to distribution to determine if the wording of questions was clear, how long it took to complete the survey, and whether there were any items in need of revision. Five employees representing different service points, age groups, internet skills, and roles within the library volunteered to participate in the pilot study. None of the employees were members of the task force groups that would later take the finalized survey. Volunteer participants were timed on how long they took to complete the survey. Timing was of particular concern because other employees would be reluctant to take the survey if it took too much time to complete. Fortunately, the volunteers took only 5 to 10 minutes to complete the survey.

After volunteer participants completed the survey questionnaire, they were asked to indicate whether the questions made sense to them and if there were any that were
confusing. All responses indicated no areas of concern or confusion. It seems efforts to design a clear and concise survey were successful.

Survey Administration and Data Input

Survey questionnaires were distributed to and collected from task force members during the last ten minutes of a strategic planning wrap-up meeting. Nearly all task force members were in attendance, making it easier to maximize convenience and participation. Absent task force members were later contacted and subsequently completed the survey. Once all survey responses were collected, they were coded and entered into the SPSS program. Frequencies and Cross Tab statistics were generated to reveal potential correlations.

Findings and Data Analysis

Demographics

In all, twenty-five strategic planning task force members completed the survey on wiki use. This represents 100% of the total population. The participants were comprised of nine (36.0%) librarians, twelve (48.0%) support staff members, and four (16.0%) managers. The educational background of this group included three (12.0%) Associate Arts degrees, ten (40.0%) Bachelor degrees, and twelve (48.0%) Master degrees or above. Eighteen (72.0%) participants were 45 years of age or older. Seven (28.0%) were under 45 years of age. [See Table 1 for details.]

A surprising response from survey participants contradicted popular perceptions concerning age and internet skill level. Specifically, the 45 and older participants reported slightly higher levels of internet expertise than those under 45. Ten out of eighteen (55.5%) of those over 45 years of age indicated they were advanced intermediate or
expert level. Three out of seven (42.8%) of those under 45 years of age saw themselves as advanced intermediate or expert level in using the internet and other online tools. None of the participants rated their internet skills at a beginner level.

[See Table 2 for details.]

Use of the Strategic Planning Wiki

All twenty-five (100%) participants indicated at least accessing the strategic planning wiki. More than half of the participants utilized features such as adding and editing text, uploading files, creating links to web sites and files. Participants noted in their comments that ease of use, real time access and availability, the ability to track the progress of all groups, and having resources in one centralized location were valuable wiki features.

Least used features included email, RSS, making calendar entries, and creating target links. While most participants rated the wiki as “very easy” or “somewhat easy” to use, their comments revealed a broader picture of difficulties they encountered. Several noted problems with formatting (“Limitations in formatting,” “Not everyone had the same understanding of how we were using the wiki,” “Difficult to create a nice-looking document – fonts different sizes, bullet problems, etc.”). Others indicated that HTML knowledge was necessary to fully utilize the wiki. Creating target links, linking to documents, and using the “help” feature were especially problematic for a few participants. [See Table 3 and Table 4 for details.]

Usefulness of the Strategic Planning Wiki

The majority of participants viewed the Strategic Planning wiki as very useful or somewhat useful in terms of a documentation and communication tool. It is interesting to
note that Learning 2.0 participation had little impact on the perceived usefulness of the wiki. Also, none of the participants rated the wiki as “very difficult” in either category. [See Table 5 and Table 6 for details.]

Conclusion

Summary

For the University Library strategic planning process, adopting wiki technology as a collaborative tool was efficient, effective, convenient, and appropriate. All task force members used the wiki. Most reported it to be a useful tool for communication and documentation rating tasks such as accessing, editing, and adding comments to the wiki to be very or somewhat easy. Completion of the Learning 2.0 exercises did not appear to have greatly influenced the use or comfort level with wiki features which suggests promise for those with little technical experience. Many participants did not utilize more advanced features such as RSS feeds or creating links, while those that did found the process to be problematic. Participants responses to the open ended survey questions revealed that help documentation could be improved, formatting easier to manage, and knowledge of HTML useful.

Future Studies

Wiki engines like PBWiki appear to be fairly simple and easy to use; however there are many grey areas for further investigation. Do different wiki tools and features help or hinder individual users in meeting their needs? Are various wiki engines and software 508 compliant? Also, how do wikis influence the decision-making process in different workplace collaboration? While wikis hold promise and possibility for communities of practice, future studies will determine what features are desirable and
supportive in unique settings, which will guide the development of more user-centric tools.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-35 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-44 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55 yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+ yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>beginner</td>
<td>early intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki Features</td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access the wiki</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add text</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add comments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit text</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upload files</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create links to web sites</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create links to files</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create target / table of content links</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new pages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make calendar entries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use email features</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use RSS feature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify HTML source code</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use help feature</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Ease of use of PBWiki Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Ease of Use by # of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access the wiki</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add text</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add comments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit text</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upload files</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create links to web sites</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create links to files</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create target / table of content links</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new pages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make calendar entries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use email features</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use RSS feature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify HTML source code</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Learning 2.0</td>
<td>very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Usefulness of PBWiki as a Documentation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participated in Learning 2.0</th>
<th>very useful</th>
<th>somewhat useful</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Difficult</th>
<th>very difficult</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Screen Shot of SJSU Strategic Planning Wiki Home Page

Welcome to the Strategic Planning Wiki!

Each task force can visit, add to, and edit their own pages. Other resources are available below for further background information and guidance.

**Synthesis of Task Force Reports**

- [Steering Committee Comments](#)

**Task Forces**

- [Digital Library Initiative Task Force](#) - Report
- [Knowledge Base Task Force](#) - Report
- [Inquiry Learning Task Force](#) - Report
- [Community Partnership Task Force](#) - Report
- [Organizational Capacity & Growth Task Force](#) - Report

**Other Resources**

- [Strategic Planning Documents](#)
- [Calendar](#)
- [Steering Committee Web Site and Related Articles](#)
Appendix 2: Strategic Planning Wiki Survey

1. Please indicate your role in the library.
   __Librarian  __Support Staff  __Manager (MPP)  __Other (please specify): ______________

2. Please select your age group.
   __18-25  __26-35  __36-45  __45-55  __56+

3. How would you describe your skills using the internet and online tools?
   __Beginner  __Early Intermediate  __Intermediate  __Advanced Intermediate  __Expert
   Comments (optional):

4. Your highest degree is:
   __Masters or above
   __BA/BS
   __AA
   __High school diploma or equivalent

5. Did you participate in the Learning 2.0 exercises at King Library or elsewhere?
   __Yes  __No  __Don’t Know

6. If you answered “yes” for number 5, please indicate how many Learning 2.0 exercises you completed. If you answered “no” for number 5, please skip to question 7.
   __I completed all of the exercises
   __I completed more than half of the exercises
   __I completed less than half of the exercises
   Comments (optional):
7. Prior to the Learning 2.0 initiative at King Library, had you ever used or created a wiki? Please check all that apply.

   _I used a wiki    _I created a wiki    _I had not used or created a wiki

   Comments (optional):

8. Since the Learning 2.0 initiative at King Library, have you used or created a wiki? Please check all that apply.

   _I used a wiki    _I created a wiki    _I have not used or created a wiki

   Comments (optional):

9. Have you used the SJSU Strategic Planning wiki?

   _Yes    _No    _Don’t Know

10. If you answered “yes” for question 9, please indicate the kinds of tasks you performed. Check all that apply. If you answered “no” for question 9, you have completed our survey. Thank you.

    _I accessed the wiki to look at task force(s) progress

    _I added text to the wiki

    _I added comments to the wiki

    _I edited text in the wiki

    _I uploaded files

    _I created links to web sites in the wiki

    _I created target/table of content links

    _I created links to files or documents

    _I created a new page in the wiki
I made calendar entries in the wiki
I used the email feature of the wiki to be notified when updates were made
I used the RSS feed feature of the wiki to be notified when updates were made
I modified the source (HTML) code of wiki pages
I used the help feature of the wiki
Other (please specify): __________________________

11. Please describe your overall experience using the wiki. Choose a single answer for all tasks (11a – 11n) that apply.

11a. Accessing the wiki to look at task force(s) progress
   __ very easy  __ somewhat easy  __ undecided  __ somewhat difficult  __ very difficult
   Comments (optional):

11b. Adding text to the wiki
   __ very easy  __ somewhat easy  __ undecided  __ somewhat difficult  __ very difficult
   Comments (optional):

11c. Adding comments to the wiki
   __ very easy  __ somewhat easy  __ undecided  __ somewhat difficult  __ very difficult
   Comments (optional):

11d. Editing text in the wiki
   __ very easy  __ somewhat easy  __ undecided  __ somewhat difficult  __ very difficult
   Comments (optional):

11e. Uploading files in the wiki
   __ very easy  __ somewhat easy  __ undecided  __ somewhat difficult  __ very difficult
   Comments (optional):
11f. Creating links to web sites in the wiki

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11g. Creating target / table of content links in the wiki

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11h. Creating links to files or documents in the wiki

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11i. Creating new pages in the wiki

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11j. Making calendar entries in the wiki

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11k. Using the email feature of the wiki to be notified when updates were made

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11l. Using the RSS feed feature of the wiki to be notified when updates were made

__very easy  __somewhat easy  __undecided  __somewhat difficult  __very difficult

Comments (optional):
11m. Modifying source (HTML) code in wiki pages

__very easy __somewhat easy __undecided __somewhat difficult __very difficult

Comments (optional):

11n. Using the help feature of the wiki

__very easy __somewhat easy __undecided __somewhat difficult __very difficult

Comments (optional):

12. How would you describe the wiki as a tool for documenting task force progress?

__very useful __somewhat useful __undecided __somewhat difficult __very difficult

Comments (optional):

13. How would you describe the wiki as a communication tool for task group members?

__very useful __somewhat useful __undecided __somewhat difficult __very difficult

Comments (optional):

14. What did you like best about the SJSU Strategic Planning wiki?

15. What did you like least about the SJSU Strategic Planning wiki?