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# Executive Summary

The first GC2.0 Tools User Study was conducted in 2013 to gauge the needs of current and potential future users, in order to better understand why public servants use the GC2.0 Tools, and to identify the barriers that limit use. It also created the baseline for analysis, gathering feedback from users based on the enhancements made and identifying additional areas for improvement.

As the GC2.0 Tools, especially GCconnex, have seen major change and growth over the last year, the User Study was repeated, to pinpoint areas for continued improvement. The second Study, conducted in 2014, was open for participation from October 6 to November 19, and received 7,198 responses. In order to validate the User Study sample, a user analysis, which examined 200 users of GCpedia and GCconnex, was also completed. It was found that the User Study sample was representative of the actual users of the GC2.0 Tools, as well as to the Federal Public Service as a whole.

The results of the 2014 study are presented in three categories:

1. How Public Servants Work,
2. Awareness and Use of the GC2.0 Tools, and
3. Barriers to Use.

## Key takeaways from the 2014 study

The launch of the Clerk’s Blueprint 2020 initiative on June 7, 2013 led to a large increase in the awareness and use of GCconnex. By contrast, according to the 2014 User Study, GCpedia and GCforums[[1]](#footnote-1) experienced a small decrease in awareness and use over the same period (5% and 9% respectively).

Public Servants in the younger age group (24-34 years old) and new (less than three years’ service) public servants were among the most frequent users of the GC2.0 Tools. Frequent users of the GC2.0 Tools, both GCpedia and GCconnex, tended to also use other wikis and blogs, both personally and professionally, on a regular basis.

Similar to the 2013 study, results showed that:

* Many public servants were still not aware of the GC2.0 Tools;
* The majority of the users of the GC2.0 Tools were located in the National Capital Region.

Although many public servants see the benefits to using the GC2.0 Tools, barriers to use still exist. Barriers include: lack of awareness and knowledge on how to use the GC2.0 Tools, uncertainty about what benefits the GC2.0 Tools provide and the fact that not all of their colleagues use the GC2.0 Tools. These responses were most apparent in public servants over 55 years of age, and those with between 11 to 20 years of work experience in Public Service.

Stemming from these and other results and commitments, the GC2.0 Tools Team in the Treasury Board Secretariat is working on the following activities to enhance the GC2.0 Tools:

1. Continued performance enhancements and server optimization;
2. Creation of a simplified sign-on for GCpedia and GCconnex (completed as of May 2015);
3. Installation of a Google Search Appliance with a federated search capability; and
4. Implementation of Accessibility and Usability Enhancements (completed as of March 31, 2015);
5. Growth and expansion of the Ambassadors’ Network;
6. Building partnerships and engaging the open source community to further improve the GC2.0 Tools.
7. Production of guides to clearly explain both *how* and *why* to use the GC2.0 Tools for certain tasks;

# Introduction

The ability to share information, best practices and ideas across departments, enabled by technology, is a key factor to the success of the Blueprint 2020 vision of creating an enterprise-wide, collaborative, and modern Public Service.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The GC2.0 Tools allow public servants to overcome departmental silos and work more efficiently, providing better services for Canadians. The GC2.0 Tools, consisting of GCpedia, the official wiki, and, GCconnex, a professional networking platform, are the only collaboration tools available to all public servants in all departments for cross-department collaboration. The GC2.0 Tools User Study aims to better understand how employees collaborate, the growth and development of the GC2.0 Tools, and how they can be improved.

The first User Study, conducted in the summer of 2013, revealed that:

* Many public servants were still unaware of the GC2.0 Tools’ existence, even five years after their creation;
* Use of the GC2.0 Tools was predominantly located in the National Capital Region;
* New public servants were among the least likely to use the GC2.0 Tools; and
* Overall, new users had a hard time understanding how and why they would use the GC2.0 Tools in their work.

In response to these findings, in 2014, the GC2.0 Tools Team made a number of enhancements to the Tools, including:

* Software and server optimization for improved performance;
* Implementation of Usability and Accessibility recommendations;
* Beginning a User Experience (UX) assessment;
* Making GCpedia and GCconnex code open source on GitHub, a web-based code managemeent system, to take advantage of open-source expertise;
* Validating that the existing platforms could handle large increase in capacity (Loadrunner testing);
* Launching an Ambassadors Network to “train the trainers” in each region and department.

Since the first Study, the number of GCconnex users has increased dramatically:

* In November 2014, when the second study was conducted, GCconnex was nearing the 50,000 user milestone – a 150% growth from the time of the first study in August 2013.
* GCconnex now receives more than 2.4 million page views per month.

# Methodology

The second GC2.0 Tools User Study was conducted in 2014, from October 6 to November 19, 2014. Like the first study, conducted more than a year ago, the goal was to gauge the needs of current users of the GC2.0 Tools, as well as potential future users, to better understand why public servants use the GC2.0 Tools, and to identify the barriers that limit use. It also created the baseline for analysis, gathering feedback from users based on the enhancements made and identifying additional areas for improvement.

The study was promoted on the GC2.0 Tools themselves, through the Spotlight (a feature article on the GCpedia main page), the Wire (Twitter-like function on GCconnex), and the GC2.0 Tools group on GCconnex.

On October 10, 2014, an email with a link to the User Study was sent to all public servants registered on one of the GC2.0 Tools. The communication was sent to approximately 70,000 unique users. The study link was also spread through word of mouth via Twitter, email, functional communities such as the [Communications Community Office](http://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/Communications_Community_Office) and the [Community of Federal Regulators](http://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/Community_of_Federal_Regulators), and key stakeholders, such as the [Blueprint 2020 Secretariat](http://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/Blueprint_2020).

A total of 7,198 responses were received, which included more than 5,000 comments.

Since participation in the user study was voluntary, sample bias was a legitimate risk. To overcome bias, a User Analysis was conducted to validate the findings of the User Study. The analysis examined the demographic information of a random sample of 200 registered users on GCpedia and GCconnex. The results of this analysis, as well as the User Study demographics, were compared to the Federal Public Service demographics to see if they were a representative sample (Figure 1).



Figure

However, both the User Analysis and the User Study demographics were found to be generally representative of the Federal Public Service. The User Study respondents are also representative of GC2.0 Tools users.

There were some differences between the data sets. Whereas 42 percent of the Public Service population works in the National Capital Region (Source: [PIMART](http://publiservice.ochro-bdprh.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pimart-oragip/resources-eng.aspx)), 52% of the 2014 User Study respondents identified themselves as working in the NCR, and the 2014 User Analysis sampling identified 77% of GCpedia users and 80% of GCconnex users as NCR workers.

EX respondents were also overrepresented on the GC2.0 Tools. Only 2% of the Federal Public Service are in the EX occupational group, but the User Analysis counted 6% of GCpedia users and 11% of GCconnex users in this classification.

The 2014 report is presented in three sections:

1. How public servants work;
2. GC2.0 Tools awareness and use; and
3. Barriers to use.

# How Public Servants Work

Individual work environments have an impact on how public servants use the GC2.0 Tools.

Questions 12 to 19 of the User Study provide some context on the type of work public servants do, the time they spend on the tools, their mobility, and their social media competence.

## The Work Public Servants Do

According to the data collected during this study, public servants spend a great deal of time on “knowledge work”, such as connecting with experts, holding meetings, and communicating with others.

Almost half of User Study respondents (40%), spend more than 30 minutes each day co-creating documents, a visible increase from 29% in the 2013 Study. More people also indicated they spend over 30 minutes daily, on organizing, sharing, and managing information (32% vs 21% in 2013).

The number of respondents who believe collaborative GC2.0 Tools can help them accomplish these tasks more efficiently decreased from the first User Study to the second Study (see **Table 1**, below). For example, only 34% of 2014 respondents saw use of a collaborative tool as beneficial to finding and connecting with experts, as opposed to 42% in 2013.

The responses to **Table 1**, below, compare the time spent on various work activities with the opinion that using a collaborative tool would help in executing those activities.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity \*** | **Number of Respondents who spend 30+ minutes / day at the activity** | **Opinion that Collaborative tools could help:**  |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** |
| Finding and connecting with people | **12%** | **10%** | **42%** | **34%** |
| Planning for and conducting a meeting | **11%** | **13%** | **29%** | **23%** |
| Co-create documents | **29%** | **40%** | **41%** | **33%** |
| Organize, share, and manage information | **21%** | **32%** | **57%** | **50%** |
| Re-use existing information | **36%** | **40%** | **61%** | **54%** |
| Communicate with others | **44%** | **47%** | **44%** | **35%** |

Table

\* These activities represent the core “knowledge work” activities

Group work plays a large role in the day-to-day life of many public servants. More than half of User Study respondents (61%) are members of one to five work groups. A variety of online functions in the GC2.0 Tools are available to help groups work together.

Increasingly, public servants are using GCconnex when seeking an online group or community. Compared to external social media, email, and other communication channels, GCconnex was one of the most used GC2.0 Tools for joining a group or community relevant to professional interests (37% - a 12% increase from 2013). However, traditional online tools like email were most commonly used for this task, likely because of their familiarity and versatility.

Public servants relied more on GCpedia for the consumption of information than they did on social media tools, such as Twitter or LinkedIn. For example, 21% of the respondents indicate the use of GCpedia to find content to accomplish a task more efficiently, compared to 16% that used social media.

## Mobility

Both professional and personal mobile devices are becoming a key component of workplace communication and information gathering. As shown in **Figure 2,** below, more than 25% of respondents reported that they used a smartphone provided by their employer in the performance of work duties. Another 19% use either a Government-provided tablet or other mobile device.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Figure 2: Mobile device use

The GC2.0 Tools are not accessible on *personal* mobile devices, as they run behind the Government of Canada firewall, therefore offsite and off-hours use is limited to those users who can access the GC2.0 Tools via the with Government-provided mobile devices.

One user commented that “logging on from home or with a mobile app increases usability and contribution to online communities.” If mobile devices were available to all public servants by their employer, they would be able to access work-related information and online tools regardless of their location.

Nearly a quarter (24%) of respondents used their personal smartphone for work purposes; almost as many as the 26% who use a Government-provided smartphone. Another 11% reported that they have used a personal tablet for work purposes. This is indicative of a global trend towards Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) and a general blurring between personal and professional use of technology.

## Information Security

Protecting secure information is a high priority in the Public Service. The GC2.0 Tools operate on SCNet, a Government-wide server, able to house information up to a Protected B level.

As seen in **Figure 3**, the majority of public servants work with colleagues on information classified Protected A or B on a weekly basis (72% and 66% respectively). However, the percentages rapidly decrease as the security level increases. Only 14% of respondents work with information classified as Protected C or higher on a weekly basis.

Figure 3

Some occupational groups handle sensitive information more often than others. Figure 4 shows that just over 20% of AS (Administrative Services) respondents dealt with Secret information either daily or weekly, and almost 15% dealt with information classified Top Secret or higher. The EC, EX, and FB (Border Services) groups, especially, are more likely to deal with secret information (17%, 7%, and 4% said they did so daily or weekly). Those in the CR (Clerical and Regulatory) and FS (Foreign Service) groups, on the other hand, were more likely to use Top Secret information or higher daily or weekly (9% and 7% respectively).

Figure 4: Frequency of use of secure information

The more often a public servant handles secure information, the less likely they are to be frequent (daily or weekly) users of the GC2.0 Tools. For example, only 22% of those who handle secret information and 14% of those who handle top secret information on a regular basis (at least weekly) use GCconnex frequently; much less than the 30% of public servants who regularly handle Protected A information and still use GCconnex frequently. This could be due to a different organizational culture, fear of security breaches or an inability to use the GC2.0 Tools for common work activity.

Those who do work with information above Protected B have concerns about how they can effectively use GC2.0 Tools. According to one respondent,

“…there needs to be a consistent interpretation and application of information sharing. Departments and Branches do not have the same understanding of how to apply the concept of information security… This could result in over-sharing protected information and under-sharing unclassified information. We need a common understanding and application so we can take advantage of the efficiencies from collaboration.”

Awareness and education on security of information is needed, so users can learn how and when it is appropriate to share information and where GCpedia and GCconnex fit into the existing ecosystem of tools used within the Public Service. This education should also address organizational culture and focus on increasing the comfort level of those that do regularly handle sensitive information.

## Use of Collaborative Tools

Social media tools can be used for both personal and work purposes. The User Study aimed to gauge respondents’ familiarity with a variety of platforms, which were divided into three categories:

1. **External social media:** Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.
2. **Wikis and Blogs:** GCpedia, Wikipedia, GCconnex, WordPress, etc.
3. **Other collaborative Tools:** Google Docs, SharePoint, Evernote, etc.

**Table 2** shows that external social media tools were most likely to be used for personal purposes only (58%). However, 21% of respondents used social media tools for both personal and work purposes in 2014, roughly the same as in 2013 (22%).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **External social media** | **Wikis and blogs** | **Other collaborative tools** |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** |
| Work purposes | 2% | 2% | 11% | 9% | 15% | 14% |
| Personal purposes | 56% | 58% | 21% | 18% | 23% | 24% |
| Personal and work | 22% | 21% | 12% | 9% | 15% | 15% |
| Do not use at all | 20% | 19% | 56% | 64% | 47% | 47% |

Table

29% of respondents reported using other collaborative tools at work, either solely for work (14%) or in combination with personal use (15%). These other collaborative tools were used more often for work purposes than either social media (23%) or wikis/blogs (18%). This could be due to departmental instances of SharePoint and wikis, which one respondent said they had “use[d] … extensively for file sharing and collaboration.”

Collaborative tools can increase one’s productivity at work by facilitating networking, knowledge sharing, and communication.[[4]](#footnote-4) In 2014, more respondents said they found information on GCconnex that saved them time than in 2013 (23% vs 14%). GCconnex also helped a growing number of users be more innovative and agile (**Table 3**).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GCpedia** | **GCconnex** | **GCforums** |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** |
| The GC2.0 Tools help me find information that saves me time | 41% | 35% | 14% | 23% | 23% | 15% |
| The GC2.0 Tools help me be more innovative | 24% | 20% | 13% | 20% | 14% | 9% |
| The GC2.0 Tools help me be more agile | 18% | 15% | 9% | 13% | 11% | 7% |

Table

Others are unsure of how to properly use external social media (e.g. Twitter) at work. Another respondent shared concerns that “security policies and use of social media for both personal and work reasons appear to be at odds and [is] personally not comfortable mixing the two together.”

Training on Government policies, such as the [Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Use](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=27122), is needed so that public servants can feel comfortable when using social media in the workplace. Courses like “[Social Media in the Government of Canada](http://www.csps-efpc.gc.ca/forlearners/coursesandprograms/CourseDetail-eng.aspx?courseno=B334),” offered through the Canada School of Public Service, are good sources of information to gain the knowledge and practical experience needed.

# GC2.0 Tools Awareness and Use

Results from the 2014 User Study showed significant changes in the awareness and use of the GC2.0 Tools over the last year. GCconnex especially has seen increased awareness and use due to its role in the Government-wide Blueprint 2020 consultations. The following section will discuss how the Tools are being used, by whom, and their perceived benefits.

## Use of the GC2.0 Tools

As seen in **Figure 5**, awareness of GCconnex increased by 18% from 2013. Awareness of GCpedia and GCforums, on the other hand, decreased slightly. A possible cause could be that new users who joined GCconnex as a result of Blueprint 2020 are not aware of the other GC2.0 Tools. It is likely that GCforums experienced a decrease in awareness as a result of the decision to sunset the platform, made in late 2013.

Figure 5

**Figure 6** shows that the number of people who had used GCconnex in the last 12 months also increased by 17% versus the 2013 User Study, while the use of GCpedia and GCforums decreased by 10% and 18% respectively.

GCpedia has followed a trend similar to other social media platforms where a small percentage of users contribute most of the content and the majority of users “lurk” or browse.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The decline in GCforums use is likely due to the strategy in place to sunset the platform and increased emphasis on GCconnex for communication and collaboration.

Figure 6: 2013-2014 Volume of GC2.0 Tools users

Respondents who use GCpedia and GCconnex often were more likely to also use wikis and blogs for personal and work purposes.

Approximately 25% of those who used GCpedia every day and 24% of those who used it every week also use wikis and blogs for both work and personal purposes. Those who use GCpedia occasionally (less than once a month) are more likely to use wikis and blogs for only personal purposes. Similar trends are seen in GCconnex, as shown in **Figure 7**.

Figure 7: GCpedia and GCconnex use by Wiki & Blog Use

**Figure 8** shows that members of each occupational group were fairly well represented in the User Study. Similar to the 2013 results, some groups such as the AS, CS, and EC category, were overrepresented in the User Study Sample in comparison with their representation in the Public Service population.

 Figure 8: User Study Respondents by Occupational Group

Not surprisingly, the respondents in the IS (information services) classification were among the top users of both GCpedia and GCconnex. However they are no longer the most frequent users, as they were in 2013. They have been surpassed by the AS, CS, and EC categories on GCpedia, and by AS, PM, EC, and CS categories on GCconnex (see **Figure 9**).

Figure 9: GC2.0 Tools Daily and weekly users

Interestingly, EXs were among the most likely to have used any of the GC2.0 Tools in the last year (3% used GCpedia and GCconnex, 4% used GCforums), even though they make up only 2% of User Study respondents. However, they were not the GC2.0 Tools’ most frequent users. For example, only 7% of EXs said they used GCconnex either daily or weekly, an 8% decrease from 2013.

**Figure 10** shows that use of the GC2.0 Tools, particularly GCpedia and GCforums, is primarily located in the National Capital Region (NCR). Of those respondents that indicated they had used GCpedia, GCconnex or GCforums in the last year, approximately 66%, 50% and 63%, respectively, were from the NCR.

In comparison, Ontario has the highest percentage of regional respondents to have used the GC2.0 Tools in the last year; 8% used GCpedia, 14% used GCconnex, and 10% used GCforums.

Figure 10: GC2.0 Tools user geographical distribution (total 100% of users, broken down by region)

Some regions are more active on the GC2.0 Tools than others, especially GCconnex.

For example, 38% of respondents from Prince Edward Island (PEI) use GCconnex either daily or weekly, a significant increase from 16% in 2013 (**Figure 11**) and ahead of even the NCR (19%) and Ontario (18%).

Figure 11: GC2.0 Tools - Daily and Weekly Use by Region

Newer public servants (less than three years) are much more likely to use GCpedia and GCconnex daily or weekly (16% on GCpedia and 22% on GCconnex), while mid-career respondents (between three and 20 years) were less likely. Those with more than 11 years of service were more likely to be daily or weekly users of GCforums (5%) than any other group.

Figure 12: GC2.0 Tools - Daily and Weekly Use by Years of Service

Young public servants were also more likely to use the GC2.0 Tools. Users of 24 years (and under) to 34 years of age were the most common daily and weekly users, especially for GCconnex (24%, 21% and 16%). Frequency of use dropped as age increased; however, those 60 and over were more likely to use GCconnex daily or weekly than those in their 50s.

The frequency of GCconnex use has grown across the board since 2013, even among older users. In 2013, only 5% of respondents over 60 used GCconnex daily or weekly. In 2014, that number has risen to 14%.

Users in the 50 to 59 age group were slightly more likely to be daily or weekly users of (the now defunct) GCforums (11%).

Figure 13 – Weekly and Daily users by Age Group

## Benefits to Use

Collaborative tools are designed to help increase productivity and efficiency.

**Figure 14** shows that the majority of respondents did think activities such as finding and re-using information (54%) or organizing and managing that information (50%) could benefit from collaborative tools.

Provide feedback on a document

 Figure 14: Collaborative Tools and work style

Respondents who have worked in the Public Service for more than 20 years were less likely to see the value collaborative tools could add to accomplishing tasks like co-creating documents, finding and sharing information, or planning meetings (**Figure 15**).

Years of service, on the other hand, did not have a large impact on whether or not a respondent believed collaborative tools, like the GC2.0 Tools, could help them with these tasks.

Figure 15: Collaborative Tools and work duties

Many public servants use GCpedia and GCconnex to increase their communications opportunity to great success. One respondent indicated that they “love being able to post on GCpedia to get timely information out to departments. Very quick approvals when compared to sending out a mass email or posting online.”

However, some of the respondents reported the need for more enhancements before the GC2.0 Tools can really help. Another comment stated that the GC2.0 Tools are “easy to use if the frequency is high. If it is a result of a project or a ‘one off’ usage, it becomes more challenging.”

While the majority of responses show that while the GC2.0 Tools can have a positive impact on the workplace, more work is required to enhance the platforms and their usability while increasing awareness and knowledge of the users on how and why they should use them in their own day-to-day work.

# Barriers to Use

To ensure the continued success of the GC2.0 Tools, it is important to identify barriers that prevent or inhibit public servants from using them. By recognizing deterrents, actions can be identified to address them.

The top three barriers to use of the GC2.0 Tools, as shown in Figure 16, were:

1. “I don’t know what I would use them for”;
2. “The people I collaborate with do not use them”;
3. “I don’t know how to use them”

Figure 16: Barriers for using GC2.0 Tools

\*Multiple responses could be selected

The results of this question remained fairly similar to the results of the 2013 User Study. While 45% of respondents don’t know how to use the GC2.0 Tools at all, only 14% indicated they had tried to use them before finding them too complicated. This demonstrates a need for continued usability improvements as well as outreach, awareness and learning on how to use the GC2.0 Tools and clear articulation of the benefits of use.

Overall, GCpedia and GCconnex were perceived as easy to use, as shown in **Table 3**. GCconnex saw an 11% increase in the number of respondents who thought it was easy to use, now at 40%. Many respondents are still unsure about the ease of use (40% don’t know for GCpedia; 37% don’t know for GCconnex). The high number of unsure responses could be due to the large volume of new users seeing the GC2.0 Tools for the first time.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Are the GC2.0 Tools easy to use?** | **Yes** | **No** | **Don’t know / Not sure** |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** | **2013** | **2014** |
| **GCpedia** | 51% | 43% | 18% | 17% | 31% | 40% |
| **GCconnex** | 28% | 40% | 16% | 23% | 57% | 37% |
| **GCforums** | 39% | 24% | 14% | 12% | 47% | 63% |

Table : GC2.0 Tools ease of use

There was a strong correlation between the users’ age group and their identified barriers to use. Public servants between the ages of 50 and 54 consistently identified more barriers than those in the younger age groups. As shown in **Figure 17,** 21% of those aged 50 to 54 said they did not know how to use the GC2.0 Tools compared to less than 1% of those under 24 and 4% of 25 to 29 year olds. The same trend holds true for responses related to “I don’t know what to use them for” and “My co-workers do not use the GC2.0 Tools.”

Figure 17: User age and barriers to use GC2.0 Tools

The relationship between age and barriers to use of the Tools could be a result of younger generations growing up with social media tools and being more experienced and accepting of them.

It could also indicate *perceived* barriers, rather than *actual* barriers. For example, it is possible some respondents that indicated they do not know how to use the GC2.0 Tools have not actually logged on or tried to use them.

Similar trends in age and barriers to use were seen in **Figure 18**.

Figure 18

Newer public servants with fewer than three years of service also found the GC2.0 Tools easier to use and those with 11 to 20 years of service struggled most, as shown in **Figure 19**. Public servants that had 3 to 20 years of service were, interestingly, found to be the most common daily and weekly users and also reported the most barriers to use.

Figure 19

Being uncomfortable working on a platform open to the entire Public Service was a recurring theme throughout the anecdotal comments: “…not everyone wants to have their name associated forever with something they post...” This is may speak to the significant culture change occurring within the Government at the moment and the shift from traditional bureaucratic processes. One respondent wrote:

“People are nervous that the boss will get angry if they post or comment on GCconnex or edit our GCpedia articles. Putting something ‘out there’ without an approvals process goes against everything that has been hammered into people's heads in the years they've worked here, so they feel really hesitant to do it. They aren't sure what they are allowed to post, and a lot of people are still hesitant to share even completely benign public information. They're also nervous that they'll screw something up/accidentally delete something when they aren't used to using the GC2.0 Tools.”

While the GC2.0 Tools will continue to improve performance and the user experience, making them easier and more intuitive to use, the Public Service culture of risk aversion may remain the largest barrier to adoption.

Finally, search engine performance and the outdated information, were among the concerns noted several times in the User Study comments. An individual stated that “because searching is so slow and scattergun, one checks internal departmental sources first and only turns to GCpedia as a secondary resort.” Another wrote that the “lack of wiki gardeners in GCpedia leads to disorganized and sometimes outdated content.” This highlights the work that needs to be done around search and information management on the GC2.0 Tools.

# Summary of Findings

This report discussed how public servants work, their awareness and use of the GC2.0 Tools, and the barriers they face when trying to use them. The quantitative and qualitative data analysis revealed that although the GC2.0 Tools help public servants work more efficiently, there is significant room to improve the tools and their performance.

## Recommendations

As we move towards the Public Service of the future, GCpedia and GCconnex can help public servants become more agile and efficient in working with colleagues across the Public Service and in reducing organizational information silos. With the increase in use, there was also an increase in the number of people experiencing difficulty using the GC2.0 Tools.

Since the Studies were conducted, the GC2.0 Tools Team in TBS, with the support of users and key stakeholders, has been working on the following initiatives to continue to improve the experience for users.

### Outreach and Engagement

After seven years of existence, many public servants are still not aware of the GC2.0 Tools. Those who are aware of them, often lack an understanding on how to use them in their day-to-day work.

1. **Continue to Grow the Ambassadors’ Network**The [GC2.0 Tools Ambassadors’ Network](http://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/Ambassadors_Network_for_the_GC2.0_Tools_/_R%C3%A9seau_des_ambassadeurs_des_outils_GC2.0) aims to raise awareness, and encourage use of GCpedia and GCconnex. Ambassadors promote the GC2.0 Tools within their networks, departments, and regions through presentations and awareness sessions.

As of December 2014, there were 172 members of the Ambassadors’ Network from across Canada. Combined, they gave 61 presentations in 2014 that reached almost 1,000 participants. Ambassadors will continue to give presentations and promote the GC2.0 Tools, especially in their regions.

1. **Produce materials (i.e. guides) to explain both how and why to use the GC2.0 Tools for certain tasks and use cases**
Many respondents indicated that they did not know what to use the GC2.0 Tools for. This series of guides will go beyond describing how to perform certain functions (such as creating a group), and explain why one would want to. The guides demonstrate the value that the collaborative GC2.0 Tools can add to anyone’s work.

### Technical Enhancements to the GC2.0 Tools

Intuitiveness, system performance, and ease of use were concerns for some of the respondents. The technical GC2.0 Tools team has committed to implementing enhancements that will improve user experience.

1. **Continue Performance Enhancements and Server Optimization**

The GC2.0 Tools Technical Team will continue to maintain and improve GCpedia and GCconnex, using performance monitoring technology.

1. **Simplified sign-on (completed as of May 2015)**
During the time frame before and during both user studies, GCpedia and GCconnex required different sets of login information. A simplified sign-on process was rolled out in May 2015 that permits users to log into both tools simultaneously.
2. **Implement Usability and Accessibility Improvements (completed as of March 31, 2015)**

Usability and Accessibility testing undertaken by the Statistics Canada centre of expertise in the spring of 2014, identified areas for improvement, and their recommendations have been fully implemented. This ensures, to the greatest extent possible, that all public servants have an equal opportunity to use the GC2.0 Tools.

**Install Google Search Appliance with a federated search capability (expected to be enabled by end of March 2016)** Besides being a more powerful and accurate search engine, the Google Search Appliance will be capable of searching both GCpedia and GCconnex at the same time, and displaying the results collectively. This will make it easier for users to find accurate, relevant information.

1. **Build Partnerships and engage the open source community**The GC2.0 Tools Team has built relationships with international partners, such as the Netherlands and the United States Department of State, who are working on collaborative initiatives similar to the GC2.0 Tools.

As well, making the GCconnex and GCpedia code available on GitHub, will enable the open source community worldwide to share their expertise in Elgg and MediaWiki, in order to provide potential future enhancements.

These changes will make the GC2.0 Tools stronger and more user-friendly. By constantly enhancing the platforms and reducing barriers, users will be able to use GC2.0 Tools more easily, and will be more likely to see the value inherent in their use.

# Annex

## Annex A: Demographic Information

Note: Any organization not listed was not statistically significantly represented in the User Studies or User Analyses.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Department | Percen-tage of Public Service Popula-tion | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 | User Analysis GCpedia 2013 | User Analysis GCpedia 2014 | User Analysis GCconnex 2013 | User Analysis GCconnex 2014 |
| Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada | 2% | 4% | 3% | 8% | 6% | 3% | 6% |
| Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 1% |
| Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Canada Border Services Agency | 5% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 5% | 3% |
| Canada Industrial Relations Board | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Canada School of Public Service | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 4% | 1% |
| Canadian Dairy Commission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Canadian Grain Commission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Canadian Heritage | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% |
| Canadian Human Rights Commission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Canadian International Development Agency | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% |
| Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Canadian Space Agency | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Canadian Transportation Agency | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Citizenship and Immigration Canada | 2% | 2% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 4% |
| Commission for Public Complaints Against the Royal Canadian Mounted Police | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Correctional Service Canada | 7% | 3% | 5% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% |
| Courts Administration Service | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Department of Justice Canada | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 3% |
| Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Elections Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Employment and Social Development Canada | 8% | 8% | 6% | 3% | 6% | 2% | 4% |
| Environment Canada | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 5% | 4% | 3% |
| Farm Products Council of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Fisheries and Oceans Canada | 4% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 4% |
| Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada | 2% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 7% | 4% | 1% |
| Health Canada | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 5% | 9% | 6% |
| Industry Canada | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 4% | 1% | 1% |
| Infrastructure Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Library and Archives Canada | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| National Defence | 9% | 6% | 8% | 1% | 5% | 3% | 6% |
| National Library of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Natural Resources Canada | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 3% |
| Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Office of the Communications Security Establishment Commissioner | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Offices of the information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Parole Board of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Passport Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Patented Medicine Prices Review Board Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Privy Council Office | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Public Health Agency of Canada | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 3% |
| Public Prosecution Service of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Public Safety Canada | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% |
| Public Servants Disclosure Protection Tribunal Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Public Service Commission of Canada | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Public Works and Government Services Canada | 5% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 12% | 12% | 10% |
| Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Civilian Staff) | 2% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| Shared Services Canada | 2% | 0% | 4% | 10% | 6% | 1% | 3% |
| Solicitor General Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Statistics Canada | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Status of Women Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Transport Canada | 2% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat | 1% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 5% | 1% | 2% |
| Veterans Affairs Canada | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Western Economic Diversification Canada | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agency / Crown Corporation | Percen-tage of Public Service Popula-tion | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 | User Analysis GCpedia 2013 | User Analysis GCpedia 2014 | User Analysis GCconnex 2013 | User Analysis GCconnex 2014 |
| Canada Revenue Agency | 16% | 16% | 19% | 1% | 6% | 16% | 20% |
| Canadian Food Inspection Agency | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% |
| Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Communications Security Establishment | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Financial Consumer Agency of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| National Energy Board | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| National Research Council Canada | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Office of the Auditor General of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Parks Canada | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Statistical Survey Operations | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region | Percentage of Public Service population 2013 | Percentage of Public Service population 2014 | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 | User Analysis (GCpedia) 2013 | User Analysis (GCpedia) 2014 | User Analysis (GCconnex) 2013 | User Analysis (GCconnex) 2014 |
| NCR | 41% | 42% | 54% | 52% | 70% | 77% | 82% | 80% |
| ON | 15% | 15% | 12% | 13% | 6% | 8% | 1% | 10% |
| QC | 12% | 12% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| NWT | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| NU | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| YK | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| BC | 9% | 9% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 5% |
| AB | 6% | 6% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 5% | 0% |
| SK | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 0% |
| MB | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| NB | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 0% | 5% | 3% | 1% |
| NS | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 3% |
| PEI | 1% | 1% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| NFL | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Outside Canada | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Occupational Group | Percentage of Public Service Population 2013 | Percentage of Public Service Population 2014 | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 |
| AS | 12% | 12% | 16% | 16% |
| AU | 2% | 0% | 2% | 2% |
| BI | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| CO | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| CR | 10% | 9% | 4% | 4% |
| CS | 7% | 7% | 11% | 10% |
| CX | 3% | 3% | 0% | 1% |
| EC | 5% | 5% | 8% | 7% |
| EG | 4% | 4% | 2% | 2% |
| EN | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| EX | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% |
| FB | 4% | 4% | 2% | 1% |
| FI | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% |
| FS | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| GL | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| GS | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| GT | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| HR | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| IS | 1% | 1% | 4% | 3% |
| LA | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| LS | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| MG | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% |
| NU | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| OM | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| PC | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| PE | 2% | 2% | 6% | 5% |
| PG | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% |
| RE | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| RO | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| SE | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| SG | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| SP | 10% | 10% | 7% | 10% |
| TI | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| TR | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| UNI | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| WP | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Student | N/A | N/A | 0% | 1% |
| Consultant/ Contractor | N/A | N/A | 0% | 1% |
| Other | N/A | N/A | 2% | 3% |

###

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age Group | Percentage of Public Service Population 2013 | Percentage of Public Service Population 2014 | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 |
| < 24  | 3% | 3% | 1% | 2% |
| 25-29 | 7% | 7% | 7% | 5% |
| 30-34 | 11% | 11% | 12% | 10% |
| 35-39 | 13% | 14% | 15% | 15% |
| 40-44 | 14% | 14% | 16% | 16% |
| 45-49 | 16% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| 50-54 | 18% | 18% | 18% | 19% |
| 55-59 | 12% | 12% | 10% | 12% |
| 60+ | 6% | 6% | 5% | 5% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Percentage of Public Service Population  | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 |
| Male | 46% | 40% | 39% |
| Female | 54% | 60% | 61% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Official language | Percentage of Public Service Population 2013 | Percentage of Public Service Population 2014 | User Study 2013 | User Study 2014 | User Analysis GCpedia 2013 | User Analysis GCpedia 2014 | User AnalysisGCconnex 2013 | User Analysis GCconnex 2014 |
| English | 70% | 70% | 72% | 70% | 82% | 84% | 80% | 92% |
| French | 29% | 29% | 28% | 30% | 14% | 13% | 11% | 8% |

## Annex B: GC2.0 Tools User Study Questionnaire 2014

Mandatory fields are marked with an asterisk (\*)

Welcome,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study about online collaborative tools in the Government of Canada. It should take you less than 10 minutes to complete the questions. Your responses are anonymous.

Your participation will help shape the future of the GC2.0 Tools. Even if you don't use the GC2.0 Tools or other online collaborative tools, your responses will be of great value to our work.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please contact: GCconnex@tbs-sct.gc.ca.

#### Section 1: Use of GC2.0 Tools

This section looks at how you are using the collaborative technology we have today.

##### Please indicate if you are aware of any of the following GC2.0 Tools (government-wide online collaboration systems):\*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| GCpedia |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |

##### Have you used any of the GC2.0 Tools in the last 12 months?\*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| GCpedia |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |

##### Why do you not use the GC2.0 Tools? Please select all that apply.\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | I don't know what I would use them for |
|  | I am hesitant to draw attention to myself/ I am uncomfortable working in such a "public" manner |
|  | My supervisor does not approve |
|  | I tried but it was too complicated |
|  | I can't access the tools |
|  | I don't know how to use them |
|  | I don't have time to learn something new |
|  | The people I collaborate with do not use them |
|  | The type of work I do does not require collaboration |
|  | The type of work I do is secret/confidential |
|  | I can't remember my username or password |
|  | Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

##### Which of your regular work activities would benefit from using a collaborative tool? Please select all that apply.\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Finding and connecting with people |
|  | Planning for and conducting a meeting |
|  | Co-creating a document or other information resource |
|  | Providing feedback on a document (e.g. draft policy consultation) |
|  | Organizing, sharing and managing information |
|  | Finding and re-using information provided by other individuals/groups |
|  | None of the above |

##### If there are other activities that you think would benefit from a collaborative tool, please list them below:

##### In the last 12 months, how frequently have you used the GC2.0 Tools?\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very infrequently (less than once a month) | Somewhat infrequently (once a month) | Occasionally (a few times a month) | Somewhat frequently (weekly) | Very frequently (daily) | Not at all |
| GCpedia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### When you have used the GC2.0 Tools (GCpedia, GCconnex or GCforums) did you find them effective in helping you accomplish your intended task?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |
|  | Don't Know / Not Sure |

##### Please indicate the reason you did not accomplish your intended task. For each of the statements below, check the tool to which you feel the statement applies. If you feel the statement does not apply to any of the GC2.0 Tools, please don't check any items -- leave the line blank.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums |
| Could not find who or what I was looking for |  |  |  |
| Information was outdated or inaccurate |  |  |  |
| Poor system performance |  |  |  |
| Difficulty with login |  |  |  |
| Challenges with the interface |  |  |  |
| Poor mobile access |  |  |  |
| The people I needed to reach did not use the tool |  |  |  |
| Search did not return any results |  |  |  |
| Search did not return relevant results |  |  |  |
| Could not share/access the desired file format |  |  |  |

##### Other, please specify:

##### Are the GC2.0 Tools easy to use?\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| GCpedia |  |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |  |

##### Optional Note:

##### Have you ever found information on the GC2.0 Tools that saved you time or improved your ability to do your work?\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| GCpedia |  |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |  |

##### Optional Note:

#####

##### Has using the GC2.0 Tools allowed you to be more innovative in your work?\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| GCpedia |  |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |  |

##### Optional Note:

#####

##### Do the GC2.0 Tools allow you to be more agile in responding to shifting priorities?\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| GCpedia |  |  |  |
| GCconnex |  |  |  |
| GCforums |  |  |  |

##### Optional Note:

#####

#### Section 2: Collaboration Environment

These questions are intended to help us identify the most common opportunities for improved collaboration support across the Government of Canada.

##### Team Dependence

How many projects, initiatives or group activities are you typically involved with?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 0 |
|  | 1-3 |
|  | 4-5 |
|  | 6-7 |
|  | 8-9 |
|  | 10+ |
|  | Don't Know / Not Sure |

##### Information Intensity

In a **typical day**, how much time do you spend:\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | None | 1-15 min | 16-30 min | 31-60 min | 1-2 hours | 2+ hours | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| Searching for a subject matter expert who can provide advice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharing or sending information more than once (including answering questions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Searching for information required for your own projects, initiatives, or activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Providing updates on projects or activities in meetings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Providing individual briefings up or down |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organizing meetings or events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborating with others on a document or other information resource |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organizing and classifying information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Mobility

Do you use any of the following mobile devices in the performance of your **work** duties?\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure |
| A smartphone provided by your employer |  |  |  |
| A tablet device provided by your employer |  |  |  |
| Another mobile device provided by your employer |  |  |  |
| Your personal smartphone |  |  |  |
| Your personal tablet |  |  |  |
| Another personal mobile device |  |  |  |

##### Information Security

How often do you work with colleagues on information that is classified as:\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Daily | Weekly | Monthly | Semi-Annually | Annually | Less often than Annually | Never |
| Protected A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Secret |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Top Secret or higher |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Collaboration Activities

Please indicate through which method you have undertaken the following activities in the last 12 months. If you have not undertaken the activity, leave that answer blank.

##### Find and Connect

In the last 12 months, which of these tools have you used to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums | Social Media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn) | Other online tools (e.g. e-mail) | Off-line (e.g. phone or meeting) |
| Find someone that can help you accomplish your task |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow someone's public activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Watch or subscribe to content, like a wiki page or discussion forum |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Join a group or community relevant to your professional interests |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Convene

In the last 12 months, which of these tools have you used to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums | Social Media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn) | Other online tools (e.g. e-mail) | Off-line (e.g. phone or meeting) |
| Plan or host a meeting or event |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Publicize a meeting location and time |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Create an agenda for a meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capture RSVPs for a meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share documents relevant to a meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participate in a discussion at a meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Document the discussion or decisions resulting from a meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vote or express a position on a decision to be made |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Co-Create

In the last 12 months, which of these tools have you used to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums | Social Media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn) | Other online tools (e.g. e-mail) | Off-line (e.g. phone or meeting) |
| Prepare a draft document |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share a document for comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Request feedback |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ask for information or advice about a project |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provide comments on a document |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coordinate the creation of a document by multiple authors |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Curate

In the last 12 months, which of these tools have you used to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums | Social Media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn) | Other online tools (e.g. e-mail) | Off-line (e.g. phone or meeting) |
| Add a category or tag to content |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Create or update a personal profile |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delete or suggest content be deleted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share a link to an information resource |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summarize and share the knowledge from a conference or other learning event |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Help others learn about a topic of professional interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### Consume

In the last 12 months, which of these tools have you used to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GCpedia | GCconnex | GCforums | Social Media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn) | Other online tools (e.g. e-mail) | Off-line (e.g. phone or meeting) |
| Find content that helps you accomplish a task more efficiently |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Find information to support a decision |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Find information that you could re-use (e.g. an example, best practice or template) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Find a new career opportunity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##### If there are other collaboration activities that you regularly undertake which were not included in the previous lists, please add them below:\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No Comment |

#### Section 3: Familiarity with Social Media

These questions are designed to help us understand your level of awareness towards social media and collaboration platforms.

##### Do you use social media such as Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes for work purposes |
|  | Yes for personal purposes |
|  | Yes for both personal and work purposes |
|  | Do not use at all |

##### Do you contribute to on-line platforms such as wikis, blogs or on-line forums? (either as an author of articles or posting comments)\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes for work purposes |
|  | Yes for personal purposes |
|  | Yes for both personal and work purposes |
|  | Do not use at all |

##### Do you use any on-line collaborative tools such as Google documents/Google drive, Office 365, SharePoint, or Evernote?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes for work purposes |
|  | Yes for personal purposes |
|  | Yes for both personal and work purposes |
|  | Do not use at all |

#### Section 4: Demographics

##### In which department/agency are you currently working?\*

##### In which province or territory do you work?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | National Capital Region (NCR) |
|  | Ontario (excluding NCR) |
|  | Quebec (excluding NCR) |
|  | Northwest Territories |
|  | Nunavut |
|  | Yukon |
|  | British Columbia |
|  | Alberta |
|  | Saskatchewan |
|  | Manitoba |
|  | New Brunswick |
|  | Nova Scotia |
|  | Prince Edward Island |
|  | Newfoundland and Labrador |
|  | Outside of Canada |

##### Please indicate your occupational group:\*

If you are in an acting position, specify the group of the acting position.

##### Please indicate your level:\*

For example, for FI-03, indicate: "03". If you are in an acting position, specify the level of the acting position. If you are a student, consultant/contractor, or other type of employee without a level, please indicate "not applicable".

##### In relation to your current job, with which area of work do you most closely identify?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Access to information and privacy |
|  | Government and Information Technology security |
|  | Information management |
|  | Information technology |
|  | Finance |
|  | Internal audit |
|  | Procurement, real property and material management |
|  | Evaluation |
|  | Human resources |
|  | Communications |
|  | Science and technology |
|  | Federal regulators |
|  | Health care practitioners |
|  | Legal services |
|  | Inspection and enforcement |
|  | Client contact centre |
|  | Administration and operations |
|  | Other direct services to the public |
|  | Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

##### What is your age group?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 24 years and under |
|  | 25 - 29 years |
|  | 30 - 34 years |
|  | 35 - 39 years |
|  | 40 - 44 years |
|  | 45 - 49 years |
|  | 50 - 54 years |
|  | 55 - 59 years |
|  | 60 years and over |

##### What is your gender?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Male |
|  | Female |

##### What is your first official language?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | English |
|  | French |

##### What official language do you use most often in the office?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | English |
|  | French |
|  | Both English and French equally |
|  | Don't Know |

##### What language do you use most often in an on-line environment?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | English |
|  | French |
|  | Both English and French equally |
|  | A language other than English or French |

##### In total, how many years have you been working for the Public Service?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Less than 3 years |
|  | 3 to 10 years |
|  | 11 to 20 years |
|  | More than 20 years |

##### Do you have any final comments or thoughts that you wish to share?\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No Comment |

**Thank You/Confirmation Message:**

Thank you for taking the time to help us with the evolution of enterprise collaboration and the GC2.0 Tools in the Government of Canada.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study or to participate further in our work, please join the [GC2.0 Tools group on GCconnex](http://gcconnex.gc.ca/groups/profile/226392/gc20-tools-outils-gc20).

Inquiries about this study should be directed to: GCconnex@tbs-sct.gc.ca.

.

1. A decision was made in late 2013 to sunset GCforums by March 31, 2015, as GCconnex offers the same functionality and much more. A transition strategy is in place, and most of the active GCforums communities have been migrated to GCconnex. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [*Destination 2020*](http://clerk.gc.ca/eng/feature.asp?pageId=378#toc2)Report, Building Canada’s Public Service Together. May 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The move from landlines to mobile phones is being implemented across 43 different departments. The use of mobile devices, including phones, laptops and tablets, also ties into the Workplace Renewal Initiative, which aims to create a more modern and productive workplace. See [Workplace 2.0 Frequently Asked Questions](http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/biens-property/mt-wp/faq-eng.html#q13) for more information. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A [2012 report](http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/high_tech_telecoms_internet/the_social_economy) from McKinsey Global Institute demonstrates that the use of collaborative tools such as social networks and wikis can raise productivity by 20 to 25%. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. As a general rule in online communities, 1% of users actively contributes the majority of content, while the rest of users “lurk” or browse. See [1% Rule (Internet Culture)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1%25_rule_%28Internet_culture%29). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)