

Digital Initiatives Steering Committee meeting
2 October 2007
Minutes

Present: Beth Black, Wes Boomgaarden, Tom Cetwinski, Tschera Connell, Nena Couch, Amy McCrory, Dan Noonan, Nancy O'Hanlon, Sally Rogers

1. The College of Humanities is forming a working group on electronic texts. Lewis Ulman asked Amy has been asked to join committee. Melanie Schlosser (SRI) and possibly Morag Boyd (SCCAT) would also be interested.
2. Tschera sent a document on file naming. She would like to defer discussion until Beth Whittaker is here.

3. The Lantern:

Six vendors scanned some samples, and the last is expected today. Amy is putting the samples on the web server and will e-mail the url when the last comes in for DISC to review. She will send the samples to Olive and to Ray Catalino for comment as well. Sally wondered whether it is ok as regards purchasing rules to send to Olive. Amy will check with purchasing. It was noted that the images are tiffs, so we may have to do a file "save as" to see the full image; however, Wes used IE7 and had no problem. Each group has 20 scanned images. Please look at one from each year and get comments back to Amy. Username: samples; password: uptime.

4. OAIS working group report:

Beth Black and Tschera created a spread sheet identifying each point in trustworthy repository checklist and examined what we do with KB. Later on we will expand to encompass other digital activities. Amy wrote additional notes on each point which are on the J drive. The summary begins with areas in which we are compliant or close to compliant. Areas which need worked are divided into three sections. Wes asked how serious the collection level data lack is – should it be handled sooner than other issues? Tschera said that the department is looking to see if METS is useful to take care of collection level data because it is hierarchical. Decisions about collections is the kind of community level information that is needed – ex. MSA scanning at two different levels at different times. This sort of information is now kept in Project Load, but it is project based. Tschera and Beth said that many institutions are beginning to look at this issue, but there is very little written so far. Someone in California is looking at how rules can be automated once preservation strategy decisions have been made. Conclusions about what we need to do regardless of what other activities are going on at national and international level: 1) lack of centralized plan (ex. standards for each format that we need); 2) preservation plan – identifying file formats to be supported and finding documents to support it; 3) centralized documentation about activities including agreement with OIT, changes made as a result of testing; and 4) policy statement probably needs to be re-examined in light of experience. Amy notes that we are reaching the limits of how much the j drive can serve our needs, and need to look at another system. If SharePoint has a table of contents or drop down, it would be a great

advantage, but won't be available at least until winter. Dan expressed concern that SharePoint data are stored as "blobs" (binary large object) embedded in database. Dan suggests that Stellent Soft might be a possibility. The university has an enterprise license for it. Nancy asked if it would be possible to use another instance of DSpace. Tschera noted that it is not easy to do versioning. Dan suggested putting superseded documents in KB to track history. We don't have a preservation policy although there are digitization guidelines. Should we be doing file format conversions to formats that we will continue to support? Simple batch conversions can be done easily. More complex projects will require discussion regarding how this process would scale. Tschera: there are two issues -- bit stream preservation and presentation functionality preservation. Sally: we can develop a service model so that we can provide conversion, but requiring certain formats is antithetical to our KB mission. We tell people that we will preserve their material, but we haven't really figured out how we will be doing it. For the documentation, there is a lot on the horizon. What we need to do: for each of three high level points (collection-level data, centralized prose documentation, preservation strategy documentation), a document should be written. Tschera, Beth and Amy will work on the preservation strategy, Dan will work on centralized documentation, and SRI is working on collection-level data.

4. Nena reported that work is proceeding on the joint IMLS/CMA grant proposal. The curators involved from both organizations met to determine specific content for the project in the CMA and OSU collections. The areas in which we have strengths include War, Youth and Poverty, and Civil Rights. Rather than going for a full leadership grant, it has been decided to apply for a planning grant. In order to do that, we don't need to know how, but must have clear goals about what we want to accomplish. [The minutes from the curators meetings are in the DISC space in the CMA IMLS project folder.]

5. Sally, Wes, Larry, and Tom met to discuss marketing plan for digital projects. Larry is working on plan which he will bring to the November meeting. There are two audiences we need to reach: within the library to talk more about procedure and outside the library to publicize what we do. We believe that faculty think of us in a very traditional way, and we need to find ways to broaden their understanding. Tschera noted that we are high on numbers of submissions to the KB, but low on sustained submissions. We have spikes because of large batch load submissions. We need to decide how we measure success because some communities may have achieved what they wanted. Tom's concern is with communities that are still generating material but have stopped contributing to KB. Nancy noted that outcomes assessment would be very useful.

6. Sally talked with Shelly Strosnyder who facilitated the LOTS retreat last year about helping us develop strategic plan. She will come to talk with Wes and Sally on November to talk about what a mini-retreat might look like and what we might hope to accomplish. We are re-defining ourselves and need to decide what being at the steering phase means. A mind-mapping exercise (core concept in center and brainstorm around it) might be a useful activity. This is a strategic plan for what DISC should be doing, not for all digital activities within OSUL. If a larger strategic plan is developed, the DISC plan would feed into it. After the first of the year is better than December, probably in

February. Let Sally know what we think about whether it is better to have two smaller sessions or one longer period. Beth B. supports the two 2-hour sessions.

7. The EAD Task Force is putting the finishing touches on EAD inputting for finding aids. The task force will put the application up for testing in November for two months. The task force would try to release it in January. There has been no discussion with OhioLink about architecture of the system. Cara Gilgenbach and Amy will send a proposal to Anita and Ann about how it should look. They hope that the programmers will get to work on it to be ready for January. Sally thinks there may be a communication disconnect about what is left to do. Amy noted that OhioLink must develop a means of transmitting finding aids developed on KSU server.

8. Future topics for discussion:

Tschera would like to discuss what services we want to be offering. Preserving our own collections is a pretty standard thing that OSUL should do, and if collections are going to Media Manager, they aren't being preserved. Amy also supports this concern. This is something that should grow out of the strategic plan. Media Manager does something different than DSpace, so it may be the best choice for certain needs. DSpace continues to change, and there are things that we might be able to do now that we weren't initially. We should do a presentation of what DSpace can now do. Mannequin may also provide greater flexibility.

Dan would like to continue to look at file formats and conversion.

Nancy asked if it would be appropriate for DISC to take a role in the Google books project. Tschera would like to develop seamless presentation of services to the user. Sally noted that we may be participating in a Mellon grant that is related to the silo issue in the library catalog and other resources.

The file naming discussion may continue on e-mail before the next meeting because of time constraints.

Update on KB migration – Beth Black.

Update on analog to digital sound files – Dan.