DigitalPreservation**Coalition**

Closing the Digital Curation Gap Meeting: June 2011

1. Introduction

On 28th June 2011 a joint meeting of the US and UK partners of the Closing the Digital Curation Gap project (http://www.digitalcurationexchange.org/cdcg/) was held at the JISC London office. The aims of the meeting were to discuss the outputs of the project to date and to set objectives for the continuation of the work in 2011/12.

(These **informal notes** are intended to give DPC members an informal briefing about what was discussed. They are partial, are not intended as an official record and should not be understood to represent the views of the DPC.)

2. Attendees

Neil Grindley (JISC), Liz Bishoff (The Bishoff Group), Marieke Guy (UKOLN), Michael Furlough (Penn State University Libraries) , Bill Veillette (Northeast Document Conservation Centre), Scott Brandt (Purdue University Libraries), Sharon McMeekin (DPC), Joy Davidson (HATII, DCC), Laura Molloy (HATII), Helen Tibbo, Heather Bowden (both University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Wendy Duff (University of Toronto), John Webster (BL), Richard Davis (ULCC)

3. Summary of Progress to Date

- Work to date has included holding focus groups at various events, developing decision trees to help guide those undertaking digital curation work, and building the digital curation exchange website (http://digitalcurationexchange.org/). The aim has been to establish a baseline of good practice, providing users of the site with the information they would need to achieve this. The website currently contains early drafts of the decision trees which may be renamed as a 'Getting Started Guide' (to be discussed) and is only visible to project partners.
- To capture requirements for the online resource 4 Focus groups were carried out at relevant Museums, Archives and Libraries conferences. Each focus group had 9 or less participants and worked through a set list of questions with different discussions emerging.
- The focus groups were followed up with 5 interviews to get more granularity on the issues identified.
- The online resources starts with asking users what activity they want to be involved in, and then the activities are split into headings relating to tasks with stages to work through. Includes decision point templates with graphical representations, which will give a guide to actions they should take, use cases and resources available (primarily references).

4. Discussion of Online Tool

Heather Bowden demonstrated the online resource that has been developed and feedback was requested. Suggestions for changes/improvements included the following:

- Need to rearrange the page to have Use cases and Actions before references.
- Would it be possible to better label/group suggestions – particularly training - based on roles/needs? (i.e. technical, management, curatorial).
- Need to prioritise reading material more (i.e. if you only read one article, read this one). Would it be possible to use a rating system? Also perhaps include annotations indicating relevance for level of knowledge.
- Maybe only need to use 3 levels for experience/knowledge rather than 5, perhaps something like low, medium and high.
- Need to include a guide on what is meant by each level, also need to have a not applicable option.
- Should be able to record within profile the levels chosen for each question to allow people to get an overall view and track their progress as they learn.
- Need to include something on capacity for digital curation within an organisation.
- Does it need to take into consideration knowledge within an organisation as well as individuals? Might include in introductory sections material on profiling an organisation.

- Joy Davidson talked about CARDIO (http://cardio.dcc.ac.uk/), and the work carried out on creating maturity models of institutional IRs.
- Useful to include profiles/scenarios that users could identify with and would then help to point them to the specific resources that will be useful to them.
- Should try to include online video and web-based training where possible.
- Should have different ways into content/resources – in particular needs an index. Can a tag cloud be incorporated?
- What kind of people are seen as being the user group for this resource? "Self-starters", students, people doing courses? Should it have a relation to other resources? Currently being developed in isolation.
- About learning or simple 'How Tos'. Discussion around the differences, can they really be separated?
- Is it possible to have a 'one site fits all' solution? Would it be good to have different interfaces over the same content to satisfy the needs of user groups with different levels of expertise?
- What kind of social networking can be made available to bring people together? Most people want to be able to contact an individual to ask questions. Probably out with the scope of this project but perhaps a recommendation for the future.
- How can JISC resources online be integrated with this: including the 'Beginners Guide to Digital Preservation' (http://blogs.ukoln.ac.uk/jisc-beg-dig-pres/).
- Could there be a quick profiling survey that could then be used to help people make connections e.g. these are people with similar profiles, these are people who are experts in what you want to do. Could create persona types that people/orgs fit in to. Animals used as representations in similar profiling work. Are you a digital curation hippopotamus, panther or duck? Self-assessment would likely make it more attractive. Is this moving into benchmarking? But what could that be based on? Would people be willing to make their persona-level public? Can outputs of a project like CARDIO be used? Started discussing audit and certification and uploading results from this to facilitate profiling. Decided a more simple approach would be of most use here but likely out of the scope of the current project.

5. Future Plans

- How to get content added? Who can be tasked to do this? Educators (in the broadest sense), students. Would look to the project group to begin with.
- Planning another event in US using similar format to this week's set-up: project meeting then open symposium.
- What should be done in the next 12 months? Focus first on putting in more content and then might consider profiling and other issues. Project plan will be developed based on the day's discussions.

6. About this document

Version 1	Document initiated	05/07/2011	SMc
Version 2	Distributed to participants	06/07/2011	NG, LM, JD, RD, JW, MG
Version 3			