

Digital POWRR

Preserving digital Objects With Restricted Resources

MEETING MINUTES

Date: Thursday, February 13, 2014

Time: 9:15 am – 10:30 am

Place of Meeting: Founders Library 409/Conference Call

Attendees: Aaisha, Amy, Liz, Jerry, Chris, Steve, Meg, Patrice, Drew, Danielle, Jaime, Lynne, Matthew, Nathan, Stacey, Martin, Jeff

- Everyone read the project update.
 - “Well written report” everyone is up to speed
- Workshop
 - Purpose: aimed at working professionals who should have a basic understanding
 - Talking to Stakeholders: badgering administration
 - Like the approach of ‘taking it to the people’ rather than frame principles and concepts
 - Intended Outcomes
 - **Martin** would encourage thinking about learning outcomes identified up front. Spell out in the beginning and check in throughout the day. Maybe a mini-quiz to see if it stuck? Also: do we envision it being taught in digital classrooms?
 - Screenshot walk-through
 - Software on thumb drives
 - Put everything on laptop that we’re taking with us
- Process for reporting workshop impact to IMLS

- **Liz** – is there registration? Not a walk-in system because we want to gauge learning to go along with outcomes
 - Consider gauging knowledge gained with pre- and post- quiz ie. 10 questions on Survey Monkey. At end of workshop, send the post test, which would be different and separate from evaluation of structure of class/logistics
- Problems with SAA classes where they ask people to install software, unknown versions and patch levels, etc
- **Liz** would not expect them to load software – we have jam packed schedule
 - One of the things they've done is start with the NSDA levels of preservation—could be done ahead of time or in small groups
- **Meg**– imagining a pretest as 'where are you now' but Liz means a test-test
- **Amy**– pre-tests are hard if you don't know, maybe ask NSDA for surveys they have done. Always takes more time to find level of comfort with where they are as part of introductions. Over-plan and allow a lot of time for that.
 - You don't always have opportunity to know participants beforehand, want them to hear from others in the room, useful to know you aren't alone. What do you hope to get out of this?
- **Meg**– describes our meeting with Chris. What does it take to get people where they can do preservation? Stuff to prepare, pre-ingest, etc

- **Liz**– likes NSDA levels, allows them to think of where they are, could be done as ‘homework’
- **Lynne**– can we use ‘Walk This Way’... three things we think that will help you move forward
- **Liz**– and at the end, takeaway is how are you going to make progress using the tools
- **Workshop Structure**
 - **Meg**– decision flowchart, what level of attention to give things. May be good to give out as a guide.
 - **Lynne**– advisors should rip it apart
 - **Jerry**– questions Pinto v Cadillac approach, will the distinction be clear, maybe rethink it so that they don’t sound separate
 - **Liz**– is it more of a scale? Sophistication level. Rethink: how do we get started, then how do we grow it?
 - **Lynne**– like prepping the soil, planting stuff,
 - **Amy**– make sure it is ongoing and constant, programmatic, not project-based
 - **Liz**– growth and development. Storage, backup, health check. That’s the backup the minimum we have to do
 - **Amy**– people will want solutions, some people may have hard time with so much time devoted to advocacy—keep in mind they may be looking for technical answers
 - **Steve**– a lot of them need solutions, they can get going before getting buy-in from above

- **Lynne**– we are trying to give people background to pilot things, get momentum to get going, get the buy-in
- **Liz**– because this is IMLS– the 6 month follow-up should be part of expectations. She has been doing 3 month follow ups and experiencing little responsiveness. Might want to do online survey, but may need to call to get responses. 6 months may be a little long, 2–3 would be better. Have a sign-up list at the workshop.
- **Jerry**– hands on should be an hour but maybe more because he needs to practice
- **Liz**– also thinks hr 4 should be longer, shorten hr 5 and 6. She doesn't think you need as long for that. On her surveys, the solutions are what people like the best
- **Evaluation**
 - Did we need to talk about OAIS, was pre-reading material helpful, were other prerequisites helpful?
- **Potential for future funding**
 - In NEH– Division of Preservation and Access. He talked to someone at AHA. Wouldn't have to restrict to humanities people. Seek additional 2 years funding, would start Jan 2015. He would usually try to get tie-ins with other organizations that would make proposal strong.
 - Association for State and Local History, inquiries put in.
 - Oberlin group, AACRL, idea is to have letters of endorsement from NDSA, also more active

participants who would help us find people. Proposal due in May.

- Other potentials to keep workshops going
 - **Steve**– becomes broader question of institutional commitment. NIU or consortium needs to consider if we want work going forward. Commitment to carry forward. Bigger than workshops. Also continuity for funding for Jaime.
 - **Lynne**– mentions our meeting with CARLI
 - **Steve**– these are evolutionary things, you can't solve all problems. We could go to IMLS for Phase 2. What's the mission for the next 3 years? Without the grant and the position its really easy for this to all go away. To follow through we need investment in next 3 years.
- **Advisor Feedback**
 - None further; will add to documents
- **What Next?**
 - Our institutional plans. How do we advocate moving forward?
 - We need to write our white paper and workshop.
 - Also sit down with administration to tell them about outcomes.