

Digital Access Committee Meeting
October 12, 2009
10:00-10:45am EST

Present: Kevin Cawley (ND), Marta Deyrup (SHU), Sharon Favaro (SHU), Ann Hanlon (MU), Pat Lawton (CRRRA), Susan Leister (Georgetown), Tom Leonhardt, Chair (St. Edward's), Eric Lease Morgan (ND)

Proposed Agenda

- > 1. Review and adoption of minutes from May 5, 2009
- > 2. Update on where we are - Eric
- > 3. Acceptance testing or let's look for errors in the database
- > 4. Search utility/controlled vocabulary

Minutes

1. Review and adoption of minutes from May 5, 2009

We reviewed and approved the agenda items and agreed to add Focus Groups as discussion item #5.

2. Update on where we are - Eric

At the July meeting, we agreed to ingest 20,000 records from member institutions. We now have 20,000+ records in the vufind interface (Kevin added that the latest count is 33,742).

The current sandbox will soon be moved to the production site, catholicresearch.net.

Eric is tweaking the VuFind interface; next steps include configuring buttons like rank and review.

Eric needs to create a data input form for institutions that have no metadata. The form will include author, title, notes, subject, and location fields. Some simple rules will accompany the form, for example, if you have an author list last name first. If you have more than one author or subject, separate them by inserting a semicolon. Omit initial articles in titles.

Kevin noted that the notes field must be long enough to hold a scope note.

Eric noted the importance of distinguishing between collection and item level records.

Marta indicated that she knew of a unique parish which holds unique records appropriate to the portal content. The data input form would be useful in adding these records.

3. Acceptance testing or let's look for errors in the database

Pat proposed that we begin to examine the search and retrieval success of the

portal. Usability tests will be conducted this summer, and to prepare for that we can begin to identify and tweak common errors we have encountered. In this way, the usability tests will be more robust as they will reveal what is not yet known.

Kevin noted that these are “suggestions for improvements.”

Ann noted that this would be easy to do, and a write-up of the protocol involved would be helpful. Ann noted, too, that Milwaukee currently has no more MARC records for the portal, and no members indicated have EAD files in the queue.

Eric noted the importance of gaining a sense of what materials are in member collections that are uncataloged.

4. Search utility/controlled vocabulary

Marta asked whether the portal themes would be included in the records. Kevin responded that the themes would not appear in the records, but that crosswalks might map from portal themes to general headings.

Themes were developed to serve as suggested areas for collection development, i.e., to help members to identify what materials might be appropriate for inclusion in the portal.

Ann proposed a drop-down list of subjects in a form.

Eric said that controlled vocabulary terms in records would be ideal, but that we can live without them for now. He also noted that it is expensive to implement.

5. Focus Groups

Susan indicated that the collections people at Georgetown would be implementing the focus groups there.

Eric reported that ND had five focus groups in total.

Pat noted that the groups took seventeen days from start to finish. It was an intense seventeen days.

The focus groups are structured meetings, lasting no more than 90 minutes. 7-10 participants is ideal, with homogenous groups. In other words, it is best not to mix faculty and students in one group. Scheduling is a challenge. Snacks are advised. We are interested in participants' views on what portal content is key. Three main questions guide the groups: 1. What current resources do you use? 2. What gaps are there? That is, what materials are difficult or impossible to find? 3. What would constitute ideal portal content?

6. New Business: Committee membership

Tom asked the group whether they thought that each committee should have just one representative from each institution. The group expressed concern with the proposal, noting that representatives from one institution may bring a variety of perspectives. For example, at Notre Dame, Eric provides technical expertise and Kevin provides the archivist's perspective.

Respectfully submitted by Pat Lawton.