

## **Summary Report of Conference Call**

### **A concatenated Report of Conference Calls on January 16 and February 6, 2001**

*Present:* Chuck Bearden, David Chesnutt, Patricia Dragon, David Green, Lorna Hughes, Amy Masciola, Christina Powell, Matt Stoeffler, John Unsworth

#### **1. GUIDELINES**

Given active comments and discussion January 16, and subsequently online, Chuck Bearden produced version 3 of the Guidelines for Data Entry & Revision. Interim Guidelines 3.5 are currently available. We expect Guidelines 4.0 to be only slightly revised and to be available by Feb 16.

#### **2. WORKFLOW OUTLINE**

Matt produced a very handy Holding Directory of records from the database awaiting completion.

#### **INTRODUCTORY LETTER**

John Unsworth volunteered to find a temporary, capable graduate student who would assist in the primary outreach to project directors. John will draft (for working group approval) a letter of introduction to be mailed out by NINCH and to be sent by email to all project directors. The letter will explain the project and its significance and ask the project directors to consult a URL, where they will find a webform to complete on their project.

#### **WEB WORKFORM**

Matt will produce a webform that will display the complete record for a given project, but allowing the project director to enter and edit information only for the fields in sections 2 & 3 of the Guidelines (2 = "Fields we check/enter tentatively, prompting project contacts to amend or complete;" 3 = "Fields we ask project directors to complete by email/fax/online submission, in response to our contact.")

#### **HELP DOCUMENTATION**

The fields the project directors complete will be linked to "Help Documentation" to be developed by Lorna from the complete Guidelines.

## **HOLDING DIRECTORY**

When completed, each webform will be sent to the Holding Directory. Projects in the Holding Directory will be assigned to particular catalogers (Matt dividing the list between Rice and Michigan; Michigan and Rice then assigning catalogers to each project as they see fit - but then alerting Matt as to which project goes with which cataloger.)

When a record returns to the holding directory an automatic email will be sent to the assigned cataloger who, using the Guidelines, will check and enter the information into the database. Should there be any questions or doubt, the cataloger will contact the project director for clarification.

### **3. TIMELINE - SHORT**

We would hope to have all of the parts of this process ready to go by our next telephone call (Feb 26 or March 12). Implementation to follow.

Interim check-in on progress: early April

Expected completion of prototype: mid-May

### **4. TIMELINE - LONG**

When the prototype of the 110 NEH records is as polished as we can get it, it will be presented to key funders as a solution to their problems of knowing:

1. what other projects exist that come close to projects submitted for funding;
2. over time, what pattern of success and failure their funding of projects produce; what funders can learn about the last 5 years, say, of funding digital humanities projects.

A proposal will make the case for funders' and the community's need for the database and offer to mount funders' own funded projects for a determined fee.

The proposal will make the case that all records would have to be updated annually to remain in the database "in good stead"

The Working Group will compile a list of funders in the U.S. and in the U.K. to which the proposal could be submitted.

The Working Group prepare a general submission form for all funded digital projects and determine a working system for entry and maintenance of database.

The Working Group prepare a proposal to funders for the maintenance of the database that includes a plan for its distributed care and maintenance.