CATHOLIC RESEARCH RESOURCES ALLIANCE MEETING
NOVEMBER 1-2, 2007, BOSTON COLLEGE
"MOVING TOWARD BROADER IMPLEMENTATION"

MINUTES

PARTICIPANTS:
**Steering Committee**
- Artemis Kirk, Georgetown University
- Tom Leonhardt, St.Edward's University (**BY PHONE**)
- Howard McGinn <mcginnho@shu.edu>, Seton Hall University (**FRIDAY ONLY**)
- Michael McLane <mclane@cua.edu>, Catholic University
- Tim Meagher <meagher@cua.edu>, Catholic University
- Robert O'Neill <robert.oneill.1@bc.edu>, Boston College
- Janice Simmons-Welburn, Marquette University
- Ed Starkey <estarkey@sandiego.edu>, University of San Diego
- Jennifer Younger <jyounger@nd.edu> (Chair), University of Notre Dame

**Collection Committee**
- Matt Blessing <matt.blessing@marquette.edu>, Marquette University
- Lynn Conway, <conwayl@georgetown.edu>, Georgetown University (**BY PHONE**)
- Alan Delozier <delozial@shu.edu>, Seton Hall University
- Alan D. Krieger <Alan.D.Krieger.1@nd.edu>, University of Notre Dame
- Diane Maher <diane@sandiego.edu>, University of San Diego

**Metadata Committee**
- Ruth Bogan <boganr@georgian.edu>, Georgian Court University
- Marta Deyrup <deyrupma@shu.edu>, Seton Hall University
- Eric Lease Morgan <emorgan@nd.edu>, University of Notre Dame
- Susan Leister <sel44@georgetown.edu>, Georgetown University

**Guests**
- David Horn <horndc@bc.edu>, Boston College
- Amy Braitsch <braitsch@bc.edu>, Boston College
- Kevin Cawley <wcawley@nd.edu>, Notre Dame Archives

Thursday, November 1, Plenary Sessions (Morning)
Welcome, introductions and adoption of agenda:  Jennifer Younger

Jennifer gave a brief update (with handout) of activities to date.
1. Leadership Committee:  In addition to the members listed on the handout, Jennifer reported that Mary Lyons, incoming Chair of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU), had also accepted a position on the committee.  The purpose of the Committee is to increase our credibility, to help connect us to funding, to serve as a sounding board and to promote our vision and mission within the Catholic community.

Other potential members of the leadership Committee are being considered. Tim Meagher suggested recruiting someone for the Leadership Council from among the Women Religious.

2. Update on Fund raising activities: Jennifer Younger, Mike McLane, Tim Meagher and Artemis Kirk are working on a variety of possibilities. Steering Committee institutions have contributed $55,000 to date. We have sent a proposal to members of the ACCU Board regarding a solicitation of ACCU members that could be made.

3. Overview of EAD (Encoded Archival Description) given by Kevin Cawley, Notre Dame:
In Archives work, there are large collections of manuscripts for which Finding Aids (a detailed inventory) are created and then cataloged. Item level description does not represent the structure of archives; documents have meaning in context. The purpose of EAD is to identify all fields in a record and create tags for document description so that the information can be shared electronically.

4. The CRRA portal project must have standards so that all resources appear as a result of the same search. Must all CRRA participants use EAD? There must be straightforward guidelines. EAD is appropriate for most holdings, but not all (e.g., rare books). The Metadata Committee will have to advise us as to the standards to be used. Not every item in every collection will be digitized; Finding Aids will retain their importance. When we arrive at the point where we want to include diocesan and religious order archives, we will have to provide workshops on creating Finding Aids, converting them to EAD, etc. This will happen in stages. Possible stages include: 1. Participants contribute names of collections and short descriptions; 2. EAD pilot project; 3. digitization of items.

5. Overview of CRRA Portal given by Eric Morgan, Notre Dame:
The goal is to enable scholars to identify and use material held in various archives. EAD will be used to describe this material. (An extensive description of EAD files ensued.) A longer term goal of the portal project is to digitize documents for online viewing. Currently we are indexing the metadata; the full text is not on the portal. Is this what we want to continue, or to include digital content? There is a big difference between being a portal and being a repository.

Steering Committee Session (morning)
1. Funding Opportunities and Requests: We need to have our Presidential/Institutional support for the CRRA in terms of cash. Some presidents (e.g., Catholic University) have already done so. Artemis had assumed the charge of creating a PowerPoint to use as a marketing tool. The President of ACCU is receptive to putting a solicitation on their Board agenda. The president of Notre Dame wrote a letter of support to the ACCU Board. Artemis suggested that the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) might be approached for funding; they are interested in our project. Artemis also suggested that Google might also be interested in a project such as this. Also the Open Content Alliance might be interested in a large-scale digitization of manuscript collections. There are philosophical and practical considerations in dealing with either Google or OCA.
Tim Meagher and Mike McLane had visited both the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to discuss

possible funding opportunities, and provided a handout on these discussions. NEH's Division of Preservation and Access may be a good source of partial funding for the Portal project.

Jennifer Younger is working on a draft proposal to the Lilly Endowment to request $500,000 over three years to fund staff and hardware for the project. She also is in contact with FADICA (Foundations and Donors Interested in Catholic Activities); an umbrella organization which might provide some promising leads. The Committee agreed that all these possibilities should be pursued.

Steering Committee Session (afternoon)
1. The Committee discussed options for administration of the CRRA projects, as well as participation and governance. A possible ongoing structure might include: 1. staff who handle day-to-day activities; 2. Committees for administration and governance; 3. participants, who might be part of governance or who pay fees and contribute content. There are various possible models of governance/organization/membership.

The Committee discussed the need to incorporate and/or the need for a Constitution and By-laws. It was decided that at the present time we needed a Constitution and By-laws without incorporating, and to use Notre Dame as our fiscal agent. This would enable us to hire staff and solicit funding. A By-laws Committee was formed consisting of Artemis Kirk, Michael McLane and Janice Simmons-Welburn. Artemis will coordinate the work of the committee. A draft of the Constitution and By-laws will be prepared to be discussed at a Steering Committee meeting on February 4 or 5, 2008 in Washington, DC. At that point, the Steering Committee will become the Board of Trustees, and signatories to the By-laws will constitute the founding members.

Plenary Session (Afternoon)
1. Steering Committee report of morning sessions.
2. Joint Session Report (Metadata and Collections Committees):
   Metadata Committee discussed the need for technical guidelines and willingness for all to accept them (basic metadata minimums). Marta Deyrup from Seton Hall agreed to write a draft of the standards. The intent is to be more inclusive rather than less inclusive; EAD doesn't necessarily have to be the only standard.

   Collections Committee recommends that we invite other institutions to participate sooner rather than later. There need to be multiple scenarios for adding content to portal. There is support for brief collection level data as well as more complex EAD Finding Aids. Some questions arose: Is the pilot project ended? Should we expand the number of themes? Will the Collections Committee have a continuing role of oversight of the collections?
3. The Joint Committee discussed the job description for a proposed project manager, who will be responsible for coordination, communication and (possibly) training. The job description needs to be well-articulated. Qualifications would include people skills, knowledge of the Catholic tradition, previous experience. It has to be decided to whom this position would report.

4. General discussion: Artemis stated that the current CRRA membership should contribute more content before we add other themes or expand opportunities for other institutions to participate.

Tim Meagher questioned: if we allow other metadata forms will they all integrate? Not everybody has EAD files. Eric Johnson indicated that he could enable participants to add MARC records to the portal database. Tim also mentioned that currently there is content on the Portal which does not fit into either current theme. The question was raised: is the Pilot Project continuing? It was agreed that as a prelude to a Funded Project, we could expand the themes and encourage current members to expand their contributions to the Portal. Artemis recommended that the Collections Committee propose a list of five important additional themes. The Steering Committee could suggest additional institutions which could be invited to join CRRA in the near future. We are still in the Pilot Project mode due to tenuous funding. It was also agreed that we should develop the means to measure the number of hits on the Portal.

5. Principles for committee governance and decision-making will be addressed by the Constitution and By-laws Committee, who requested that comments and suggestions be sent to them as soon as possible.

Other questions to be addressed: the role of the Project Manager vis a vis the Board; who is responsible for fixing technical problems within submissions? Presumably, the Board and Committees will set policy and standards and the staff will interpret and enforce them.

Steering Committee Session (Friday morning)
1. Review of Action Item #13: Develop growth plan to expand portal.
   Jennifer will update the Prospectus to reflect actions accomplished, in process and to be done. Artemis suggested that we need to develop a timeline and circulate it to the Steering Committee. Timeline should be for 3-5 years (since we have already completed the first two years) and should include such items as the next set of collection themes, the next set of portal participants, and the addition of the Scholarly Advisory Committee.
2. Scholarly Advisory Committee: Tim Meagher will consult with representatives of the Collections Committee and solicit nominees for this Committee. It should include a variety of scholars, not only historians. Artemis suggested we recruit scholarly societies to endorse the CRRA and the portal. They could also serve as advisors on content, perhaps contribute funds. By-laws will address the role of Scholarly Partners (institutional partners).
3. Funding: A proposal to the ACCU is underway. Jennifer will develop a proposal for Lilly requesting funds to hire a project manager. We could then make proposals to different Catholic foundations to generate startup money. We could go to several foundations simultaneously for related but distinct projects. We need to develop a timeline and a clear statement of the proposed project. We should aim for 2009 to develop a proposal for NEH.
4. Project Director: Is title Project manager or Executive Director? Full or part time? Where housed? Who supervises? Responsibilities and expectations?

Plenary Session (Friday morning)

1. Steering Committee Report:  Steering Committee will draft timeline.  Tim Meagher will continue to work on Scholarly Advisory Committee, including working scholars and scholarly society partners.  We will pursue ACCU and private foundations for funding.  We will meet on February 4 to discuss funding, bylaws, etc.
2. Metadata/Collections Committees Report:  Collections Committee will develop (pending approval) six additional themes, and will develop a review process before collections are added to Portal.  Existing members will be encouraged to contribute more content to existing themes.  Metadata Committee will finish draft guidelines by Christmas.  By summer, they will develop item level and data level input forms, and they will also develop an Advanced Search option by summer.  Staff position needs to be filled before additional members are brought on board.
3. Ed Starkey recommended that we identify similar projects and monitor their progress.
4. It was revealed that there currently two different versions of the Portal:  an EAD version and a MARC version (catholic research.net/crra).  Data from version one has to be incorporated into version two, which will become the default version.
5. Communication Activities and Responsibilities:  Eric stated that we need to solve the problem of communication to the entire group (members of all committees).  Jennifer will create a list for the entire group, as well as for individual committees.  For communication, we could use whichever list was most appropriate.  We may develop a wiki for ongoing working projects.  We may create a "behind the scenes" website for ongoing work.  Jennifer sends out an e-mail update twice a year to ACCU librarians and other interested parties.
6. Public relations:  Should we have a presence at Catholic Library Association and ATLA?  Jennifer wrote an article for Catholic Library World in March 2007.  Ed and Jennifer are writing a chapter on CRRA for the book "Digital Scholarship" which will be published in mid 2008.  We can publish articles in other newsletters, etc.  Jennifer will review the drafts first for accuracy, consistency, etc.  Erik is publishing an article in the LITA Journal which will mention CRRA.
7. Meeting adjourned with the feeling that much had been accomplished and much remained to be done!

Respectfully submitted
Your humble Secretary,
Michael J. McLane