Day 1 - September 27th, 2012

- Matt started the meeting by reviewing the agenda for Day 1

- Each of the document authors then provided brief overviews of each of their documents & took feedback from the group
  - Geneva Henry
    - Geneva acknowledged that even though she did not have a lot drafted at the time of the meeting she felt confident in her outline at this point
    - Matt agreed
    - Gail had provided Geneva with some comments by email that addressed usage of terminology regarding access restrictions (e.g., embargo can encompass many things including no access, delayed access, and withdrawing ETDs)
    - The group agreed to discuss terminology during the meeting - see below
    - Matt suggested starting a wiki page as a next step action item
  - Daniel Alemneh
    - Daniel gave a thorough overview of his document and reaffirmed his satisfaction with addressing metadata more broadly beyond preservation & PREMIS
    - Matt encouraged Daniel to clearly address all of the appropriate audiences that need to use this document
      - This led to general agreement across the group that each document should have a prefatory paragraph that made it clear what the purpose and rationale for the document is and who it is addressed to
    - Matt affirmed that it appears that Daniel is doing a good job of defining what metadata approaches lend themselves to what types of activities
      - Matt also encouraged plotting each metadata approach on a lifecycle map
      - This comment led to general agreement across the group that we need to clearly define what we mean by lifecycle management in the Introduction
        - Bill Donovan shared a lifecycle model we could use as a reference
  - Bill Donovan
    - Bill drew attention to his section on file naming conventions and said these might be too prescriptive - he plans to revisit that section
    - Bill drew attention to his formats table and acknowledges that he needs to be careful with specifying formats because everybody has different
feelings about what is appropriate

• Yan and Matt encouraged pointing back to multiple authorities rather than trying to settle arguments - LoC Sustainable Formats Registry, PRONOM, UDFR, National Library of New Zealand Formats Registry, etc.

• Bill also drew attention to his section on the preemptive format migration issue, versions, and checksumming - plans to give that some further thought

• Bill also requested a combined bibliography
  • Geneva suggested creating a Zotero Group to bridge bibliographies - this was created on Day 2 - see notes

○ Lucy Wang
  • Lucy expressed concerns about the proper levels for defining/listing internal and external stakeholders
    • The group encouraged her to avoid listing each preservation service provider - may want to just group them together like she did for the internal stakeholders
  • Lucy also expressed concerns about overlap between her sections and others' documents
    • Matt strongly encouraged again that we try to do a good job of identifying where the overlaps are occurring and noting those, but not getting too bogged down at this early stage for how much redundant writing the authors are doing - we can bring it together at the editing stage
      ○ This led to discussions about the documents as a group, as an integrated work, as a book, etc.
      ○ The group took note that there are several ways to handle the integration of the documents and we need to be strategic about our roadmap in the Introduction

○ Gail McMillan
  • Gail asked for advice on her document - she thought it needed some reframing
  • Gail got encouraged by the group to define the overall set of cost factors and attempt to plot which ones were most critical for ETD programs at various stages of development
    • Emphasis was given to the fact that some of those costs may be sunk costs depending on what stage an ETD program is at
    • The need for case studies from ETD programs at various stages of development was addressed
• Matt stressed that Gail may not need to advocate for one model (LIFE) but could point to how each of her identified models has its proper usage for various stages
• Gail mentioned that she might like to change the name of her document to Planning and Cost Estimations
  • This led to good discussions about the relationship between Lucy, Gail and Martin’s documents
    ○ Martin thought that maybe his document should be combined with Gail’s and vice versa
    ○ Matt emphasized that he thought Martin’s was still a good standalone document because it is a little more big picture - not just about costs or implementations - but how to make decisions about a range of options
  • This got more attention on Day 2 - see notes
○ Patricia Hswe
  • Patricia discussed the importance of incorporating sub-topic headings
  • Patricia discussed the importance of clarifying the international copyright issues
  • Patricia discussed the importance of clarifying the fair use options in the context of the ARL briefing
  • Patricia discussed the IP section, which led to a discussion on sponsored research and embargoes
    • Some ETDs are never allowed to be accessed or cataloged due to classified research - would be worthwhile to look at how policies handle this from institution to institution
      ○ Gail would like to advocate for cataloging the ETD at a minimum
  • The group discussed the importance of addressing the rights issues with respect to preservation copies and how institutions define that - another area to look at in terms of institutional copyright policies
  • Plagiarism with respect to international students was also discussed
    • Need to go to the USetdA 2012 conference site and retrieve those resources on plagiarism and international students
○ Yan Han
  • Yan gave a thorough overview of his document
  • Yan raised the concern about lack of citation analysis for ETDs - this might be a very effective but as yet unexplored approach to collecting usage metrics
    • Patricia mentioned that she could follow up with Lee Giles at Penn who has done work in citation analysis for other content
• The group really liked the way Yan’s document offered lots of sources and viewpoints
  • Matt encouraged Yan to also consider synthesizing some of the source material and offering recommendations that encapsulate the best approaches between the different findings
  ○ Martin Halbert
    • Martin stressed that he feels strongly that his document is very contingent on what gets documented in many of the other documents
    • Martin discussed the need for a survey that addresses the current state of ETD programs and policies
      • Gail would like to couple this with some questions about how ETD programs estimate costs and at what stages
      • Gail shared a previous survey document that could be used as a starting point - this will be an action item

• The group transitioned to a lengthy discussion on consistent terminology usage across all the documents
  ○ USetdA & NDLTD have two semi-overlapping glossaries that some of the authors are already using
    • The group spent some time comparing terms
      • Martin suggested a reformulation of "ETD Program" - currently not satisfied with either set of definitions
      • Bill Donovan suggested that we try to make "ingest" a proper term for our documents - wanted some time to consult OAIS
      • Matt encouraged all of the authors to refer to these existing glossaries if they were satisfied with the terms, and where they were defining a term differently, call attention to it in their document, and we can make sure to build a referenceable glossary for the documents - at that stage of things we can wrangle over consistent usage across the documents and make things consistent where needed
        ○ Some of this consistency cleanup can fall to Katherine & Matt at the editing stage
      • The group agreed to continue some of the conversation by email - Martin proposed some alternative definitions for ETD Programs that some authors exchanged edits on

• The group discussed the timeline for completing drafts and carrying out review phase at each project partner site
  ○ Each author committed to completing their final rough draft by November
21st or first week in December
- In order to keep us to deadlines the group decided to use CNI as an end date and to use CNI as a review hand-off to Joan Lippencott - wouldn’t dare let her down
  - We will also be passing along the documents to Gail Clemens for review at this time
- Matt & Katherine will need the last week in November and the first week in December to do some preliminary editing
- The documents also need to go back to each project partner site at the same time as the CNI hand-off
  - Matt will prepare some brown-bag lunch slides that each of the authors can use to debrief their colleagues and provide them with review instructions
  - We will set a date for receiving all review feedback by end of February (02/22) just prior to TxETDA 2013 (02/28-03/01)
- The group went on to discuss what would be needed for the workshop and education materials
  - The group would like to model the workshop off of the modular based format of LoC’s DPOE workshops
  - Discussed the need to structure the workshop to accommodate both beginners and more advanced ETD practitioners
    - Tentatively settled on a full-day format with first two hours as overview for beginners and advanced and a four hour session with modules running in parallel - more advanced attendees can self-select interest areas and beginners can bounce between
  - Also discussed the need to begin thinking about licensing the documents and the workshop slides and ed materials
  - Planning on a half-day pilot workshop on the first day of TxETDA 2013 (February 28th)
    - Two hours of overview followed by two hours of focus groups on 1-2 document areas
  - Final workshop will be held as a Pre-conference workshop the day before USetdA 2013 (July 23rd)
    - Our final steering committee will be held on the day after the conference closes (July 27th)
  - Each of the authors will take the lead with Matt’s help to bullet out slide decks and notes for each document area
  - Matt will take the lead templating education materials - how to teach the modules, attendee materials, etc.
Day 2 - September 28th, 2012

Matt opened the morning by reviewing the meeting agenda, the summary points, and the next steps action items from the previous day

- Next Steps Action Items included:
  - Build a wiki for glossary of terms (Matt will take the lead)
  - Create a Zotero Group for combining bibliographies (Geneva taking the lead)
  - Develop survey questions for Martin & Gail (Matt can help)
  - Develop brown bag lunch slide deck for document reviews (Matt will take the lead)
  - Develop workshop and education materials (authors will take the lead with Matt’s help)
  - Set up case study interviews w/Gail (Matt can help)
  - Establish document templates akin to GDDP/ANADP (Matt & Katherine will take the lead)

Matt then reviewed the revised project workplan with the group

- See attached with inline revisions - this will be reported to IMLS at the end of October

The group then spent from 10:00am-12:00pm doing individual writing on their draft documents

The group spent from 12:00pm-12:30pm having lunch and discussing individualized updates made during the writing session

Matt and Stephen then discussed the development plan for the lifecycle management tools - see attached presentation for details

- Gail questioned whether it would be more difficult to research and document the suggested functional requirements for an ETD submission system than it would be to just build a tool
  - Geneva said she thought it would be easier to document than develop
- Matt and Stephen asked what others were using for software - no other new systems were brought to our attention beyond those we are already inspecting
• Penn State has a working instance of ETD-db that we can inquire about
• Matt mentioned that we may want to follow up with technical contacts at each partner location to learn more about what makes most sense for implementations and/or integrations - stay tuned
  ○ Yan mentioned that FITS is in use at Univ. of Arizona and worth considering alongside JHOVE, JHOVE2 & DROID
  ○ Generally folks understood the shift away from development on the Digital Drop Box (already lots of working submission systems) and the Plagiarism Tools (out of scope and not originally proposed)
  • Martin requested a follow-up meeting to cover the proposed changes in more detail - this was scheduled for Monday, October 8th

• The group settled on a post-meeting date/time to reconvene - Friday, October 19th from 4-5pm ET
  ○ Meetings will be bi-weekly through the end of the year

• The meeting concluded at 1:45pm CT