

**Turnaround document:
Discussion and work plan**

Educating archivists and their constituencies
State Archives Department
Minnesota Historical Society
16-17 March 2001

Table of contents

1. What we have in common
2. Group discussion
3. Next steps (table)
4. Next steps (restatement)
5. Advanced issues
6. Evaluation
7. Appendix: project definition

NB: This document is not meant to be a complete transcription or a polished report of the meeting in St. Paul. The goal was to record the sense of the participants' contribution in order to facilitate a common understanding of the project and a consensus on its work plan. If more finished texts were available, they were pasted into the document.

What we have in common

After the project partners had completed their presentations, the project team undertook to present to the group a synopsis of what they had heard. The following document, what we have in common, was distributed to the meeting participants for comment and discussion

Here's what we heard

XML and Metadata are the way to go. Our initial supposition was correct, these are the basic tools for whatever model of custodianship and different environments

Education is a useful service and benefit to deliver

There is a need for basic electronic records education: course, basic level understanding, calibrated by audience, to lay the groundwork for XML and Metadata (either have to lay groundwork, or only pick sophisticated audiences)

XML

Where do we start? (low basic knowledge, lower among constituents)

Define a core set of knowledge (principles, elements of XML we can get across)

Frame XML in boundaries

How detailed a core?

Move into an application: demonstrate tools and incentive, tweaked and individualized to audiences, address needs and challenges an audience has

Compelling argument for why XML?

What do archivists want to do right now?

Standards will change

Keep core updated

Metadata

Comfortable, for various applications (all have worked with it)

Interest in Recordkeeping: Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standards and Department of Defense specs (Modeling)

Interest in Access: Dublin Core and GILS (EAD)

Keep core updated (introduction to purposes, then diverge into directions, with two different flavors underneath)

Education

Education good, deliver to right audience at right time

Has to be practical (deliver and derive a benefit)

Interest in application: immediate

Tools: Using the web, some very advanced

Flexible and ongoing educational process: building and repeating for archivists and constituencies

Balance between online and workshops: need to define (resource questions, delivery questions, audience questions)

Online mechanism for refreshers, perhaps core material beyond resources lists

Constituencies

Know who audience/constituents are

Have defined or can define

Prioritized, people we want to reach now

Discussed how to reach them: assume most can use or have access to the web

Common constituents: archivists, librarians, records managers, IT people

IT: GIS, auditors, enterprise-wide networks/systems, data people

Organizations change, people move around, functional alliances, not person or office, but need there because function there

Caveat

Tools: scared to recommend a software application, outside scope of the project?, cannot advocate one system over another

Lists of additional items to be considered for supplemental sessions/to be considered list (Common interest, not necessarily in scope for everyone, tweaking for individual purposes)

Tools

Modeling: example, record keeping track

EAD: example, access track

Structure of the Workshops

Building blocks, basic core introductory material

AM core session: introductory info

PM application options: follow up sessions

Identify manageable suite of options: have identified for metadata, need to identify for XML

Test pilots

Group Discussion

Once the meeting participants agreed upon what they had in common, it was clear they were ready to move into discussing the workshops themselves. What follows is a re-cap of the group's discussion and ideas on the workshops.

Charlie Arp (CA)
Phil Bantin (PB)
John Churchman (JC)
Rosemary Pleva Flynn (RF)
Edie Hedlin (EH)
Bob Horton (BH)
Richard Marciano (RM)
Glen McAninch (GM)
Ed McNeeley (EM)
Charles Robb (CR)
Shawn Rounds (SR)
Tim Slavin (TS)

CR: One issue is are we going to work on workshops for archivists and constituencies simultaneously?

BH: Sequentially or in tandem? Originally, the idea was conceived as two workshops, one aimed at archivists that had been tested on us, a pilot that would be in the train the trainer mode. Develop subject matter expertise so archivists could use XML and metadata. And, a second workshop for constituencies.

EM: Core sessions are not prerequisites for application sessions? Maybe they address different audiences?

BH: We need to do four things: define content, audiences, delivery options, and structure. Let's start with structure.

Structure

BH: As a first take let's look at it like building blocks. We'll have core sessions followed by application sessions, which are more specialized and built to address different audiences, thoughts?

TS: I offer this as way to organize my thinking: awareness, understanding of the issues, acceptance/use of the issue. A structure as how to progress people in. A certain degree of understanding goes with the core, acceptance and use goes with the applications. Perhaps try to impart this through the workshops.

PB: Understanding is the context, which begins to relate to something, the application. Add another step, a learning process, exercises, a way to engage in the process in addition to the

application. Set application, walk through it, then something they build or develop as group, or smaller groups.

BH: We like the idea of building blocks. We want to follow the awareness-understanding-acceptance model, exercises and a sense of engagement.

PB: How do we measure acceptance? How will we know when we reach it?

TS: Perhaps implementation?

XML

BH: Should we focus on XML for a second?

TS: Metadata as well. Portable, the curriculum of the core can be the same whether the audience is archivists or constituencies. The applications will be diverse/individualized. How to get people to implement, engage, and exercise?

RM: Fluffy core versus hard core. Portable common core, audience filter.

TS: The applications will drill down a bit.

RM: Example, a group at SDSC, web and portal applications group session on XML, interactive sessions, once a week over a few months, based on XML core. Used class' favorite web site as starting point, their data, wrapping it, converting it to XML. The class begin to manipulate it, each session covered a major core topic. Basic material, then download stuff from the web and work with it.

BH: Your facility with XML different than ours. Would require more advanced knowledge.

RM: Does require tools and machines, more complex.

BH: We identified our own limits as to what do with XML. Maybe a task is to learn more about it?

PB: Example, EAD workshops, people bring their own project/item to work on, people leave with their own usable product. An exercise or interactive assignment that involves something that's theirs, we may get better acceptance and participation.

CA: Are we supposed to be teaching archivists what XML is capable of or how to write XML? Two different things. XML is a programming language, requires time and skill.

RM: The interactive session was for a programming team.

CA: Not a lot of archivists understand programming.

PB: I never thought we'd teach the nuts and bolts, but the potential of XML.

ALL: Agree that potential is what is important.

BH: Recognition of limits.

SR: Which is important to note explicitly.

JC: What if people ask how to write XML, how to implement it?

CA: Need to be able to refer them to other resources for more education, so write themselves.

EM: Crosses core detail, how to recognize XML, a DTD, what is standard sort of XML may see in government activities.

BH: XML potential, introduction to XML, awareness and understanding of potential, but not actual nuts and bolts, increasing familiarity, reduce the fear factor. Need to identify audiences before deciding on applications and exercises.

GM: List potential areas, structure in a variety of environments.

RM: Another approach is a killer app, one illustration that integrates the core and technical topics. Could be artificially constructed like a story board, which shows tools or exercise of the core aspects. Show in context with examples. Web pages with successful links to walk through. Themes of interest. For example, the chemical mark-up language, in one hour covered XML, SGML, DOM, why mark-up languages are useful for chemists, how it interacts, what people have done.

PB: Great way to present overview.

RM: Themes of interest to a number of constituencies. A storyline that covers as many constituencies as possible.

EM: Question, the October MAC meeting, demonstrate the pilot workshop on project partners?

BH: Yes, and to use the conference as an opportunity and location to meet.

GM: One angle of the potential of XML is to contrast it with HTML as some other courses use. What one can't do with HTML, and what one can do with XML.

PB: Richard's point is not presentation with talking points, but points with running examples.

RM: They move forward in parallel, several storylines. Core, tag one or several, a road map for motivation.

BH: Define the core with specific examples that can link to the application.

CA: Different audiences will have different killer applications/storylines. What's the great example for archivists? What will they find most interesting to learn how to do in XML?

GM: We talked about e-mail.

EH: Websites.

CA: Another example is moving data from database to database, which may be for a specific audience. Like the e-mail idea, it's something everyone struggles with.

BH: We like the idea of demonstrating by example with XML linked to specific questions need to answer as archivists. Demonstrate as a way to deal with a particular problem.

EM: Websites have advantage of use and acceptance.

PB: More possibilities, limitations with e-mail as to what demonstrate.

GM: E-mail is also a more thorny issue.

BH: We do not want a thorny issue as our killer app.

PB: Want to demonstrate core points in a way that they grasp.

BH: The success angle is always good.

EM: Issue of web sites could discuss metadata, embedded tags. Linked workshops?

RF: Useful to the make information stick if linked.

BH: A more coherent package, particularly if look at structure of time and place, one day, two workshops over two days. Repetition and links.

GM: With the web it's easy to bring in Dublin Core.

BH: Or GILS.

JC: Specific example of something on the web, like death certificates mentioned this morning.

BH: Whose web site would be a good candidate? We want to pick a representative website.

PB: Yes, look for something representative. Something people identify with. Important to identify the points we want address and maintain that focus.

RM: The Smithsonian web site?

PB: May be very complex.

BH: Recordkeeping is another application of metadata, and was stressed in our earlier conversation. Websites are records, we need some way to keep them.

GM: That's one thing not solved with current applications, Dublin Core starts on the access side, does not address record keeping side.

BH: The web may be the best example to work with on range of issues: comprehensive appeal to audiences, metadata with access and record keeping. We have roughly defined an outline of curricula with the possibility of linking workshops.

CR: Remind me what the problem is?

BH: Dealing with web sites?

CR: Dealing?

CA: Managing them.

CR: Managing?

PB: And preservation.

CA: Charles, you look downright skeptical.

CR: Well, who is the problem for?

GM: Archivists.

CR: Who else?

GM: Example, NARA snapshot requirements.

BH: Example, MN local government. The city of Minneapolis wants to use the web for official publications. The law would have to be changed. Vocal newspaper lobby has pointed out that there is no archival component, not reliable, evidentiary problem, problem of web site disclaimer.

TS: Problem for any agency looking to publish directly to web. Solution closer to the business process if web component managed from beginning, part/product of workflow.

EM: Changes will be more frequent, more review.

BH: Manage web component or manifestation.

GM: Legal risk assessment rather than evidence standpoint, one way to manage.

EM: The problem needs more defining?

BH: Look at it as a candidate solution. Need to define the problem of managing a web site, what issues do we want to present? What problems do we want suggest we're able to solve?

PB: Anyone not have a constituency where the issue of web sites wouldn't resonate? Beyond archivists? Suitable for both? One I can think of may be auditors.

CA: This particular example is designed for archivists.

PB: I'm looking to move beyond that. Ideally to one that's suitable for all, for the introduction/core.

GM: Could convince an auditor with a transaction on the web via a form that's not capturing the elements needed.

BH: We define the web as a problem, the need to manage it, and identify problems that flow into XML and META workshops. The suitability of using the web to meet workshops for archivists and constituencies. Will what leads to acceptance among archivists be something that interests the constituencies?

EH: Perhaps one component of the archivists workshop will be defining the constituencies, and deciding whether the web site example would apply.

BH: We have identified the need to focus on content. Work with the priority first on archivists as the audience. We have picked an example: web sites, to encompass options (record keeping, access). We haven't talked about structure: time, relation to other resources...What comes to mind?

PB: One day. Half day on core, half day on applications. Move from general to specific.

RM: From one day can scale up or down as necessary, depending on what people want or need.

TS: Suggest one day stretched over two days, two half days. PM first day, then AM session the next day. People can come in during the morning and leave following afternoon. Gives opportunity to adjust at night, as well as plan, refine, absorb the material, socialize...

CA: Two three hour sessions or two four hour sessions?

BH: Four hour blocks with breaks.

RM: Example, one session encouraged people come with their data. It was converted for them over the lunch break, so they could work with it in the afternoon.

BH: Tim's structure allows ample time for the presenting team to adjust for this kind of situation.

GM: Advantage of using web sites is they're easily brought to the classroom situation. You provide and prepare, and they bring the web pages.

BH: We like the idea of a full day, split over two: keeps people's attention, allows teachers to adjust/refine/come back with second day's presentation. Structure 1st day as core, and 2nd as applications/exercises/hands-on/experience based learning. What about resources for hands-on?

TS: Success of these things based on hands-on in front of PC, rather than pencil and paper. I wouldn't pay for workshop on XML and metadata if using pencil and paper.

EM: Or, users could watch the transformation.

RM: In hands-on environments people still have option not to touch keyboard if not want to, results will be presented anyway.

TS: Requires partner with someone like universities, which have PC/lab environments.

RM: Example, presentations on MathML were held in a hotel. But, the instructor may not have time to check technical set up, manage the logistics and technical support.

PB: This is available in a university setting.

BH: How about requiring everyone to bring a laptop with everything installed?

EM: Example, one class I took the instructors directed us to a web site to download information, could call them if experienced problems. Everyone came with it installed on their laptops.

BH: Requires dedication on part of students to download.

RF: And, assumes they have access to a laptop.

GM: With laptop option able bring own work/web site and do what want with the data, versus watching a demonstration.

RM: Question, is it intimidating to be put on the spot to test things? Is hands-on counter-productive?

BH: Assumes a sophisticated audience. Need to define the audience.

SR: Archivists who do not know a lot may balk at working with computers right away.

BH: Maybe at core session not need access to computer, and have application session optional?

SR: Losing something though, archivists who see the theory won't be able see the applications and practical side.

TS: Our energy is better spent finding a location with support we just plug information into. Labs where the environment is controlled. Not want instructors to worry about configuring issues.

PB: EAD workshops have hands-on environment, and people are not intimidated.

JC: Offer plain vanilla XML, or give students tool that creates XML for them? Will they be tagging themselves, or have a tool that generates tags?

SR: Which gets back to are we teaching the potential of XML or how to create XML?

BH: We agreed on potential.

PB: Go with the tool.

EM: Tags will be apparent, they'll begin to understand what tags are about.

RM: If we go the tool route, we will need to identify a tool which works well and is easy to use. Example, Xmetal.

PB: EAD workshop putting in tags was a waste of time. Was not why I was there. Want to just see it in action.

BH: Will flow out of XML as potential, not tagging and teaching a markup language. Let's step back from tools, and define audience, delivery, and structure. The content, structure, delivery option was raised as use PCs, audience will be archivists. Are there supplemental resources we need to consider? Have you looked at the project web site? Is there something we should continue to add and annotate?

RF: Annotations helped, an important part of the resource lists. This will be helpful even on tools, annotations could describe what the tools will do for a person.

Metadata

BH: We're leaning toward a sophisticated audience. What is available so the audience is in fact sophisticated, includes resources, on-going education. To re-cap, we need to address metadata. We discussed using a representative web site as an example, to bring up questions on record keeping, access, and preservation. Need to keep in mind we're demonstrating potential rather than teaching actual skills. Need to distinguish between application as a demonstration versus application with tool. Metadata as subject of a workshop, flesh out some aspects as a topic, here's why metadata is important to you and your world. How do we use PCs to demonstrate the potential of metadata rather than demonstrating a practical tool?

GM: Example of metadata in HTML vs. XML. What standard metadata HTML header information is vs. XML situation would focus on potential, but also familiarity with tags.

EM: One is far more complex than other.

BH: Example, have web page with no metadata, demonstrate potential by show Dublin Core or GILS metadata sets. Have everyone do that?

GM: An additional example would be what able do with XML markup that can't do with those metadata sets.

EM: If we pick a particular standard to focus on, we might be out of sync with the local standards.

PB: Want to understand document from record keeping perspective, what metadata elements needed to tie to process, place in long-term event.

BH: Web page-ask what public access problems does this represent? What metadata is needed? What record keeping problems? Then move to demonstration applications with local flavors of metadata-demonstrating legality, preservation, access, record keeping, etc. What Dublin Core does, GILS does, raise other issues about metadata in terms of resources/partners/constituencies/legal and archival issues? Correct? Where do the PCs come in?

JC: Will we start with metadata or XML in the workshop?

BH: We haven't yet established that they're going to be linked. Let's flesh out how we'll use PCs in terms of a demonstration? PCs in a lab have certain implications for partnerships, requirements. Let's talk about a particular curriculum and begin to tease out the implications. Everyone's more familiar with metadata, so we're starting there. Identify elements of the core offering of metadata, so we'll understand the ramifications of using PCs.

PB: Are PCs necessary with metadata? I see a more direct link with XML?

RM: Could use a tool like TagGen.

PB: What's the benefit of that?

RM: Make things a little less abstract.

CR: If we're claiming greater retrievability, seeing it reinforces the point and makes it less abstract.

RM: Seeing and touching has effects

JC: One possibility, begin training session with specific examples that will be of interest to audience, relevant metadata to the material. How to use XML to encapsulate and make more accessible, and easy to keep records about the material.

EH: Linking metadata and XML.

BH: In one workshop?

RF: Perhaps useful as a third workshop. Keep metadata and XML as separate workshops.

BH: With separate tools.

EH: They don't need to know XML for metadata, but metadata is helpful, but not necessary for understanding XML. Audiences may not need to know both.

RM: Yes, structure and content, way capture and mark-up a document.

PB: A message with XML, the lesson is better structure.

RM: Structure and content, what additional metadata want to gather.

EM: How want to manage, here's metadata to do that.

RM: Same example revisited many times.

BH: Benefit of a web site, it's used in both. Two separate tools, not necessarily use both. Linking is harder to digest and apply.

CA: True, if not understand the concepts of metadata, then XML loses some of its possibilities. Perhaps require one workshop as prerequisite to another.

BH: XML can serve purposes the way HTML has. Want to use metadata with a purpose like access and record keeping, XML will not necessarily carry that message.

CA: Right, if we're dealing with people who do not understand the concepts of metadata, they really need to understand that before they take the XML workshop, or lose functionality, right?

BH: Full XML with knowledge of metadata.

RM: Tagging is itself a form of metadata.

EM: The four points Tim suggested, metadata is understanding, use is XML.

RM: Or, XML is transport model for metadata.

GM: Do we screen people for metadata knowledge beforehand? If not previous acquaintance have to take metadata workshop before XML, or just structure it so they learn metadata through XML?

BH: A full benefit is realized through linkage and sequence, but can't mandate it.

RM: Intriguing to have same example serve multiple purposes.

BH: And, it's easier to prepare content if we reuse stuff.

RM: Linkages will start to become implicit.

BH: Provide linkages but not necessarily mandated.

PB: Need to choose a web site which illustrates record keeping metadata. Choose a web site where the process is clear, where objects are part of a business process. How demonstrate if not good example on web pages. Needs to be more than just a static web publication.

GM: A jpg or gif as part of page, referred to in a link, attachment situation.

EH: That's not a business process.

BH: Focus on the metadata side...

PB: Isolated publications are not easy to trace. How does an archivists define a record? Business process example, admissions process, actual application forms, go through transactions on-line.

BH: Context to transactions could be publication, guidelines.

PB: We want fairly explicit examples to show part of larger process.

BH: Not only single page, but an array of pages that perhaps includes references to or an actual transaction to demonstrate the record keeping process, and a publication or document as an artifact/object.

PB: The web is not good at showing objects in relation to process.

BH: We want something that shows two processes.

EH: Like the example that Glen gave.

GM: Saying objects associated with web page, kind of fits.

BH: Linkages, something that picks up in XML, variety different formatted objects XML allows you to deal with. Web sites raise a certain number of questions, demonstrate potential

throughout. What do with PCs? When do they do something with PCs, how translate to exercises?

EM: PC a tool that shows result of process not necessarily have to do, but built into structure of workshop. PC can demonstrate before/after of a better search for example.

GM: Hands-on allows time to look at elements of transaction process, unlike demonstration which glosses over.

EM: Step one, how do they use PCs? User orientation.

BH: Value of PC speaks to immediate experience as a user.

RM: Example, Document Object Modeling class, utility put in file, DOM, got to manipulate tree and walk it together.

GM: Use business transaction example and see markup of elements in various parts of the transaction, as a walking exercise.

PB: Would be good for some audiences.

GM: For a lot of our audiences, walking a pedigree or genealogy tree would be more useful.

BH: An array of pages, archivists as first audience, appeal to them as users. First look at as user, researcher. Then, back to record keeping as second element. Once acquainted with web page as user, then talk about metadata as result of business process that presents record keeping component. Where get to access, metadata responsibilities? Where is the exercise/hands-on part?

PB: Exercises, some without computer, look at different models. Compare contrast, discuss major recordkeeping metadata sets, talk about core elements, optional elements, which most are the most important, discuss. Start introduction to metadata construction around the world.

BH: Have identified some models, GILS and Dublin Core, Australia model, Department of Defense.

PB: We may want to look at Interpares, which comes out this summer. As archivists we need to investigate other models.

EM: Can you do it in three hours?

BH: We really do have to have modest goals: awareness, engagement to allow for critical analysis, point to other sources to learn more, and equipment to allow them to make decisions.

RM: Quizzes?

BH: And gold stars. During the introduction to workshop, identify these modest goals just stated.

PB: Is there another set of metadata for archivists? Dublin Core and GILS.

BH: A significant number of people have looked at GILS.

PB: Look more critically and detail sets of metadata that are emerging as prominent. Not need computer for that, maybe save that for user element.

SR: Exercise, one thing did in study committee was look at Australian standards element by element and say how applicable to their agency, pick a record series and say how work for it.

RF: Take the web site, with this set of metadata, how apply to this page? Pick a website that people use or have something similar in their organization, gives them an idea as to how useful for them.

BH: We have a proposed curriculum: Introduction to the issue with a modest goals statement, metadata in general way, with definitions, engage people by defining it and getting a sense of their awareness. Introduction to an array of web pages that manifest questions about record keeping and access, engage people with immediate orientation and awareness as users, then responsibilities with record keeping aspect, closer to business process, issues raised by web. All general. Second session, models, record keeping and access, analysis of core/optional elements, applied to web sites used in first session. Full 6 hours of work.

EM: Several web pages vs. web site.

BH: Management cluster.

EM: Related pages in a process.

BH: Then wrap-up, repetition, summary, references to where to learn more: example websites, what maintain at MHS, access in partners local environment. In terms of metadata is that an agreeable place to start? XML different issue, have decided that we ourselves need to know more? Will rely on Richard to present models and tutorials.

RM: An assignment, do a quick survey of presentations/tutorials online. Next step, classify what most look like, chances are most will follow linear pattern: creation/syntax, process, DOM,/tree, transformation, access, querying, tools, with additional topics (Schemas, DTDs). Interesting to do overview, survey as to how packaged.

GM: ElementK is one example.

BH: Remember, point of XML is to demonstrate potential.

SR: But, Richard's survey would be a starter of other resources.

RM: If audience can get same knowledge by going to a web site, problem of time allocation, challenged with what come up with, something different and unique that not fall into this trap. Want to get people motivated and provide additional value.

PB: Storyboard idea may be our added value.

RM: If people convinced provide additional value, something that hasn't been done, present the topics/themes in novel ways.

BH: XML survey of online tutorials, add value to make it valuable for archivists and constituencies, value come out of application that has an interest to constituencies, how use for their needs. Survey of core elements, survey constituencies to meet their needs

PB: I don't have a good knowledge of XML. I can't teach it, are we going to build that in, is Richard going to teach us?

RM: Right now we should all be able to teach about potential.

BH: Yes, that's the point of the workshops, give archivists confidence and knowledge to go out and teach this.

RM: Motivation for not focusing on the core again.

PB: Suggestion, maybe an e-commerce web site as an example. Amazon.com for example, where they would actually go through a process, series of steps for ordering something.

EM: Question, who beyond this group does the turnaround document get bounced off of?

BH: Whoever we want to share with. Sounding boards. Open, not closed.

EM: Do we need to touch base with anyone else?

BH: First would come constituencies and archivists, people we work with. In terms of common elements discussed earlier, and potentially individualized for your environments.

BH: Maybe wrap-up would be advanced issues like: Modeling, EAD, e-mail

Next Steps

The Next Steps identify tasks, responsibilities, and priorities to be completed by the Project Team and Project Partners for our next meeting at the MAC conference in Indianapolis in October 2001.

Tasks	Responsibilities	Priorities
GILS and Dublin Core relative status, and relation to XML	Report from GILS Conference-Glen McAninch	Medium (end of March)
Define constituencies	Project Partners	High
Learn about XML	Project Partners	High
Survey XML tutorials	Richard Marciano and Project Team	High
Survey constituencies		
Select a web application	Project Partners	Medium
Complete turnaround document (23 March 2001)	Project Team	High
Flesh out metadata curriculum-issues, examples	Project Team	*
Review and edit turnaround document (30 March 2001)	Project partners	High
Explore technical issues/PCs	Delaware	Low
Flesh out XML curriculum-issues, examples	Project Team	*
Determine products walk away with in workshops (RFP?-XML, metadata-standards)	Project Team	*
Reporting template, changes in IT/XML		
Maintain pointed resources		
Creating a listserv	Project Team	High
Host a web site	Project Team	Completed
Identify other online complimentary/supplementary resources that will accompany the workshops	Project Partners	
Tools/vendors list	Project Partners (Begin with Richard's list)	Medium
Annotate and review resources	Project Partners	Medium
Define and agree upon goals for the workshops	Project Partners	High
Develop Evaluation method		*

(ex. Pre and post test), measure impact		
Adult education survey (COSHRC and NFACE)	Charlie Arp	Low
Issues, questions, exercises	Project Team	*
Compare standards (Interpares, DC, GILS, Aus), and metadata tools	Phil Bantin	Low

* Items identified as needing to be accomplished at the same time. All have a relatively high priority.

Restatement of Next Steps

On the basis of the discussion during the “next steps” portion of the meeting, the project staff developed a restatement of the next steps, in the form of a draft proposal of the work plan that will take us up to the meeting in Indianapolis in October.

The tasks to which we agreed are loosely arranged by topic, with responsibilities and deadlines/time periods assigned to them. In an effort to keep this clear, “project team,” means Jennifer, Shawn and Bob; “project partners” means everybody at the meeting.

1. Turnaround document

The project team will draft a turnaround document detailing what we discussed and what we agreed to do at the meeting in St. Paul. Project partners will receive this on Friday, 23 March 2001. They will review and edit the document, returning their comments to the project staff by Friday, 30 March 2001. By 6 April, the final version will be posted online to the project web site.

2. Communications

The project team will maintain a project web site and establish a project listserv to facilitate communications. The web site is already available and online. The listserv arrangements are under way and should be completed soon.

All email sent to the MHS should be copied to all members of the project team (shawn.rounds@mnhs.org, jennifer.johnson@mnhs.org and robert.horton@mnhs.org)

3. Web site resources

The project team will host and maintain lists of resources with further information on metadata, XML and education related topics. Versions of the first two are already online. The URL for the project web site is:

< <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/edarchivists.html> >.

All the project partners will contribute to these lists, sending annotated references to the MHS for inclusion, as they encounter material of interest. This is an ongoing responsibility.

Richard Marciano will forward the latest version of his list of XML tools and vendors to add to the site.

Charlie Arp will forward information from the adult education survey and projects undertaken by or identified through NFACE and COSHRC.

Phil Bantin will forward information comparing and mapping metadata standards derived from IU's work. He will track InterPares and other projects, forwarding information on the development of record keeping metadata standards.

Glen McAninch will forward a report on the upcoming state GILS conference, particularly focusing on information about the relations of GILS and Dublin Core and possible uses of XML.

These online resources will become the draft versions of the complementary or supplementary resources that will accompany the workshops.

4. XML

All project partners will take advantage of any opportunity to learn more about XML.

To facilitate this process, Richard Marciano will forward information on extant web-based XML tutorials to the project team. They will review these and develop an annotated list for distribution to the project partners.

As they review and compile XML resources, the project team will identify possible core elements and issues that should be included in a workshop curriculum. They will flesh these out in a report for the project partners to review. As the core elements are selected, the project team will identify an array of examples and applications to illustrate the elements in a workshop. From these, the project partners can recommend a set of products (e.g., an RFP) to develop in the workshop.

Richard Marciano will monitor and report on pertinent changes in XML and information technology as they develop and as they appear to affect the project.

Learning more about XML has a very high priority, as our ability to examine and evaluate options for the XML workshop will be greatly aided by a better knowledge of the topic.

5. Metadata

On the basis of the draft metadata curriculum discussed in St. Paul, the project team will develop a proposed and detailed curriculum for the metadata workshop. This will include issues, examples, exercises and possible web applications to examine. The project team will circulate this for review and analysis by the project partners.

As this topic is one where the project partners have the most ready knowledge and experience, it will be the first "product" to be developed. We can cut our teeth on this one. As the curriculum is reviewed and approved, the project partners can recommend a set of products to develop in the workshop.

6. Constituencies

As the first workshops to develop in the project are aimed at an audience of archivists, a better knowledge of the archivists' constituencies is not an immediately pressing concern. Project partners should remain aware of, though, the issues we discussed in the St. Paul meeting and begin to define and articulate the audiences we want to reach, the messages we want to deliver and the methods which will be effective. The project team will work with its constituents in Minnesota to develop a draft set of issues for circulation, comparison and review. More formal surveys of and decisions about constituencies can wait on the development of workshops for archivists; we can move forward with those as a touchstone.

7. Evaluation method

All project partners should be aware of the need to evaluate the workshops. Any suggestions for techniques or instruments should be sent to the project team, which will compile a list of options for review by October. These can be examined with the draft curricula for the workshops.

8. Next meeting

Our next meeting will be on 17-20 October, at the Midwest Archives Conference, in Indianapolis. The main item on the agenda will be the test and review of the draft workshops for archivists. Other items can be gleaned from the work plan discussed above. The project team will develop a formal agenda well in advance of the meeting for review and approval by the project partners.

Advanced Issues

Advanced issues were identified during the meeting as Parking Lot issues. At the end of the group discussion it was decided these issues could be addressed as advanced issues during the applications portion of the workshops designed for specific audiences.

Issue
Business Process Modeling
Content embedded application
E-mail
EAD

Evaluation

The meeting ended with a quick evaluation of what went well, and what could be improved in the future. The following are the group's responses to the questions what did we do well, and what could we do better?

What did we do well?

Well-defined process

We got acquainted

Stayed on schedule

Good upfront work

Good use of jargon

Became familiar with other institutions

Everyone spoke

Good food, accommodations, and facilities

Good reporting and scribing during the sessions

Good handouts during the session, especially What do we have in common?

Good work arounds on Information Technology difficulties

What could we do better?

S(lush) fund

Not enough snow

Connectivity

Regulate the room temperature

Appendix

Project definition

As Edie mentioned, we need a blisteringly clear set of purposes for the workshops. Jennifer, Shawn and Bob brainstormed a list of considerations and ideas for your review. We broke them down into terms of stakeholders, values, context and scope. Please take a look and let us know what you think. We will take the popular elements and work them into brief and compelling statements of purpose.

Stakeholders:

Emphasized Perspectives:

- Minnesota Project Team
- Project Partners
- Minnesota government agencies / partners' agencies

Other Perspectives:

- NHPRC
- Archivists
- Organizations like SAA, MAC, NAGARA (forums)
- Sources of funding
- MHS
- Public

Intentions:

Broad:

The purpose of this project is to educate a variety of constituents about the principles, products, and resources necessary to implement archival considerations in the application of information technology to government functions.

Specific:

- Raise the level of knowledge and understanding of essential electronic records skills and tools among archivists
- Help archivists to reach the electronic records creators who are their main constituencies
- Provide the means to form with those constituencies the communities of learning that will support and sustain collaboration
- Raise the profile of archivists in their organizations and promote their involvement in the design and analysis of record keeping systems
- Enable project team members to run workshops on their own

Values:

- Funding
- Education
- Building communities
- Mutual benefit / collaboration
- Practical applications
- Organizational records
- Information technology
- Reputation
- Archival principles recognized and implemented
- Building on other successful projects and products
- Solutions (tools, workshops) that are flexible and adaptable to different institutions and environments, and that are responsive to changing technologies.

Scope:

- XML
- Metadata
- Archivists
- Organization partners

Context:

Facts:

- Education *per se* is good for archivists.
- An educational role for archivists will foster collaboration.
- Knowledge and means are practical tools.
- Tools can be applied to diverse functions.

Constraints:

- Project funded for two years

Assumptions:

- Archivists have to work with IT people.
- Archivists have to work with electronic records.
- Most archivists right now do not have the means or knowledge to successfully work with IT people and electronic records.
- Project must have a promotional aspect to gain support, reach funding sources, foster collaboration, etc.
- Need to create practical, useful resources based on current practices and expectations that have broader utility than just than project.