<div align="center">

Digital Archive Committee Minutes
November 19, 2019
1:00 PM

</div>

Purpose of the Marmot Digital Archive (Tyler Dunn)

- Discussion about the purpose of the Digital Archive as well as what things exist and should exist in the archive.
- Tyler put together the Digital Archive Purpose documentation.
- Tyler had asked the group if there was any history of having some kind of statement that gives a little information about the purpose and scope of the digital archive.
- Tyler felt that she needed that level of information to create that for her own institution. She left the documentation pretty general but wanted this type of information to guide our institutional decisions.
- Tyler asked how the group would like to proceed to talk about how to add information to the documentation
- Alysa questioned the information that reads, "To be included, an object or collection should be sharable and open to anyone who wishes to access it." Alysa pointed out that some of the academic libraries have put up work that is only accessible to their students. She suggested that the group may want to think about how the phrase that particular sentence.
- Ashley is even thinking about the objects in the archive that are not viewable to anyone. She was referring to the Homer Root journals as an example of a collection that is not readily available.
- Tyler asked Brandon to talk about her understanding that he said that anything in the archives should be open and freely available. This goes back to their conversation about Fort Lewis wanting to put Open Education textbook material in the archives.
- Brandon mentioned that the only use case he had was the Aspen Music Festival recordings. After analyzing it, the amount of content that would be put into the archives would roughly amount to a couple of terabytes a year. The ultimate decision on that was because it was locked down, and it was hard for Marmot to comply with certain copyright issues, that is was easier for Marmot to offer a separate solution that kept the collection out the archive.
- Brandon commented that when it comes to an object or collection being shareable if there are any copyright issues that Marmot needs to be compliant, we need to make sure that Islandora is the tool that will allow us to comply with copyright.
- Tyler explained that the Fort Lewis Homer Root journals are uploaded, but not publically available due to sensitive content.
- Tyler wondered what cases does the group have where things are being put into the archive, but are not made available to the public, and wondered about the purpose of adding these things.
- Alysa remembers that in the planning phases when they were mapping out what they wanted to archive to do, that there were a handful of institutions that wanted their collections only visible to the students on their campus and nowhere else. They were either capstone projects or Theses. She was not sure what was added to the archive, and who had access.
- Tyler asked how is the restricted access controlled.
- Ashley replied that to the best of her knowledge it is controlled in Pika. There are setting in Pika where someone can hide specific items and collections from the view of other libraries. Ashley does not think there is anything in Islandora that drives hiding items or collections, but patrons are not accessing Islandora.
- Tyler was curious to know if an archive collection could be put behind it behind an institution's authentication.
- Brandon responded Marmot would have to be able to tie in to all the different single sign-on systems. Right now, the only Islandora authentication is through Pika or through Islandora itself.
- Pascal mentioned that the admin interface settings are used to hide collections from your own interface, so the settings do not affect other sites.
- Brandon commented that it might call out to the base part of the URL. At least in the archive, when we restrict access, we put in the site code. You type in all to allow access to all or type in a specific site code (like Adams) to restrict to just the site.
- Brandon commented that with the decision on what should exist in the archive, the question comes down to what kinds of restricted access to content should be allowed in the archive.
- Ashley commented that the reasoning for keeping things regardless of access is for longevity, being digitized and stored.
- Tyler commented that the statement, "To be included, an object or collection should be sharable and open to anyone who wishes to access it" can be taken out of the draft documentation.
- Tyler asked who mentioned they were around when the conversations were first happening about setting up Islandora.
- Alysa spoke up that she and John from Bud Werner were both around at that time.
- Tyler asked if she might be able to contact them at some point to talk more about the setup of archives. Both John and Alysa agreed to be contacted for Tyler.
- Jo chatted that she too was in o most of those conversations/meetings.
- Alison chatted that her point is that these pictures are not "shareable" so maybe say something about this, for items that have copyright restrictions.
- Tyler still does not understand what to say about what is shared or not. She is not sure if that information belongs in the Digital Archive Purpose documentation, or in the individual institution's policies.
- John agreed that maybe that information is more appropriate for the individual institution rather than in an overarching statement.

- Brandon mentioned that touching on the copyright issues that from what he can understand there is some control within Pika as far as what can be shown to patrons within the archive pages.
- Brandon mentioned that if a patron found themselves in Islandora, they do have access to the pages and the documents that are listed, whether they are logged in or not.
- Alysa asked Brandon if there is a web portal interface to Islandora without a login.
- Brandon responded that if you go to the Marmot Islandora site without being logged in, you can see everything that is in the archive at this point.
- Brandon asked Pascal if we lock down the IP for the Marmot Islandora site.
- Pascal replied that the IP was open.
- Alysa commented that locking down the IP address for the Marmot Islandora site might be a conversation for this group. She wondered if the information is being indexed by browsers.
- Pascal replied that search engines should not be indexing it because we have the Robot txt on it to say do not index this, so the search engines that observe that kind of thing would not be indexing the Marmot Islandora site.
- Alysa mentioned that she did not think the group was aware of this access, especially for those institutions that have collections with sensitive information that they did not want people to access.
- Elizabeth mentioned the Mesa County thought it was locked down as well. They have their music that would be copyrighted. She does not know if having the site open would be the best.
- Ashley asked if we have any way of restricting access to the site.
- Alysa mentioned that she can lock down access on her Drupal website.
- Brandon can change a setting that would restrict access to anyone who was not logged in, but he was not sure if they would affect anything in Pika.
- Pascal has a reservation about making any changes to access.
- Alysa pointed out that on a Drupal site each content type is listed in the permission section, and you can make each content type viewable depending on the role of a person. If you go into each content type and make sure that anyone viewing it has to be an authenticated user instead of an anonymous user, you would be removing the Marmot Islandora site from visibility to people on the outside web.
- Tyler wondered if we are talking about three different levels of access. Things that are completely pubic. Things that can be viewed by people in your own institution. Things that are completely private.
- Alysa commented that nothing should be visible unless you are logged in to the Marmot Islandora site. It should be a portal where the content can only be seen by the people in our own institutions. We just all have to agree not to look at each others stuff, especially in the case of the collections that have sensitive materials. Although, there are ways to lock things down further. She is talking about the greater public not being able to see the content on the Marmot Islandora site.
- Tyler wondered how people get access to things that are only visible at their institutions. She wondered if they needed an Islandora login.
- John replied that he thought the schools were providing student or faculty authentication in order to access content specific to that institution through Pika.
- Alysa suggested that it might be a good idea to remove the Anonymous access for the view repository access and view published content
- **Action Item:** Brandon will look into unchecking the permissions that Alysa pointed out removed to be removed from anonymous access, but will check to make sure it does not conflict with anything in Pika or the exports to DPLA.
- Alysa suggested that on the Digital Archive Purpose documentation that information is added that we acknowledge that an institution may choose not to publish something in the catalog, but it is still visible to all of us in Islandora, and we have to respectfully not mine anything from Islandora. That we understand that it is a shared sandbox with different levels of permissions, and we need to reach out to individual institutions.
- John made a suggestion to change the wording of the document from "individual Marmot libraries have the authority to determine what is appropriate to include in their own collections" to "individual Marmot libraries have the authority to determine what is appropriate to include in or make accessible from their own collections" this implies that you can use Islandora as a repository to preserve digital information, and will let institutions have discretion on what is accessible.
- Brandon wanted to know if the document needs anything added to list what types of content should exist in the archives. He wondered about this with the example that what would happen if one day the archive becomes cheaper than Google Drive that it does not just become a cloud storage platform, or do you care if it is a cloud storage platform.
- John mentioned that the wording in the document "unique local or historical value" might preclude the need for adding types of content.
- Alysa asked if it is problematic to even add a sentence that the archive is not intended to serve as cloud storage. Alysa would never consider Islandora as her Google Drive because everyone has worked so hard to make it visible in Pika.
- Pascal reminded people that one of the important things to consider that they are spending a lot of effort making this metadata to make things findable and connected. This is not just a hard drive where you can upload files.
- Brandon asked if it is necessary to have a prerequisite that objects or content connections to entities, or to other objects.
- John replied that having them connected to entities is vital, but he is unsure how to add to the documentation.

- John, Alysa, and Brandon suggested changing this sentence, "the Digital Archive documents and preserves objects of unique local or historical value and provides access to these collections to community members and academic researchers" to "the Digital Archive documents and preserves objects of unique local or historical value and provides access to these collections to community members and academic researchers this is achieved through sound metadata practices as defined in the Digital Archive Metadata Standards document."
- Tammy asked if anyone is using the archive to capture their library's history.
    - Alysa replied that Bud Werner has added history information about their history in the archive because they connect to the Bud Werner library as an entity.
    - Jo chatted that VLPI is thinking of adding the library history for a later project
    - Alison chatted that Telluride has the history of their library collection
    - Matthew chatted that EVLD is thinking of doing a project on their library history
- Pascal pointed out that when the archive was in the design phase rather than building a single document, the group wrote out note cards called user stories about all the potential ideas they wanted to have for the archive. As a group, they filter through those cards to see what they really wanted as a group. Alysa remembers that those cards were put into a document. Pascal remembers this as well, but could not find it. Alysa thinks she may still have this document and will look for it.
- Tyler asked Brandon if he could share the link to the Digital Archive Purpose document with the group, so they can look at it after the meeting.
- **Action Item:** Brandon will email the link to the group.

Metadata subgroup working meeting (Minute 38:37;21)

- Brandon explained to those who have not been here in the past that the group is working on the Metadata Standards document is creating an easy recipe for how to add content to the archive and the kinds of standards to follow when adding a new object or entity
- Elizabeth brought up that when she spoke with some of her Digital Archive coworkers in regards to rivers and making new entities with parent and child, they thought that when standards were discussed previously it was decided that the more specific places would have been linked through subject headings. This would be instead of having a bunch of different entities in the archive. She wondered if anyone else remembered that discussion.
- Alysa does remember a conversation about this where if you felt that you would be gummy up the archive with too many entities, you could put in whatever local subject heading you wanted in the subject field.
- Elizabeth pointed out that her coworkers suggested the subject heading, so they did not have to make a whole new entity or worry about putting the correct child is under that correct parent.
- Brandon wanted to verify that he was capturing the information correctly, he asked the parent part of the river would be 'Colorado River' and subject headings would be the individual locations which would be a place on the Colorado River.
- Elizabeth confirmed that Brandon was correct. She added that is you were following the Library of Congress Subject Headings, you could have 'Colorado River' and have a geographic designation of 'Steamboat Springs' as the subject heading instead of making it a whole entity.
- Alysa commented that as far as an entity is concerned, if you had the entity called 'Colorado River, USA' and you had the entity called 'Steamboat Springs, Routt County, Colorado' as two legitimate place names, those are the two entities that you would really need. You would not need a 'Colorado River, Steamboat Springs, Colorado'. You could use the other two entities to get to the same place since the role of the entity is to pull things together. If you wanted something special you can put that in the subject headings.
- Noel remembers an example of Denver and Rio Grande Railroad. Noel's point was why not use the Library of Congress (LC) Subject Headings as the default entity heading. Within the oral histories that they digitized, he put in the LC Subject Headings in the subject heading fields instead of entering in all entities for 'Denver or "Rio Grande Railroad' when there is a significant amount of content within the oral history to warrant a subject heading and not just a mention of a hotel. If there is enough mention of a hotel in Colorado, he may use the 'Hotels Colorado' subject heading. He thinks a subject heading and an entity can work together in a search. The keyword is going to locate both. Elizabeth is correct that if we put in 'Colorado River' as the subject heading and a local entity of 'Steamboat Springs" that is going to come up if someone does a 'Steamboat Springs Colorado River' search.
- Brandon shared one example of an entity in a collection where a geographic location with a map where the having 'Grand Junction, Mesa County, Colorado' does become important as far as the map geographically defining itself, and zooming in to that particular section. If it just had Mesa County, it does zoom out quite a bit to a section that has all of Mesa County rather than zooming in on the section that has the object itself. If your collection is using a map, there is some benefit to having a little bit of that geographic ability. Essentially, Google is centering in on that section.
- Noel agreed that Brandon's example made sense. His example was meant more for organization entities. He just wanted to clarify that when there are so many entities addressing the same thing, he always thought it would be better to consolidate, but other people saw the value in having all the different 'Denver' and "Rio Grande' manifestations from over the years. He does not think there were any resolutions about all those entries.
- Brandon asked if the business section that is currently listed under place belongs under the organization section.

- Alysa replied that the business section does belong under the organization section. The same with the city or town. The city of Steamboat Springs is the organization, and Routt County, Colorado is the place. She finds it difficult to know when to put something into a place or an organization. It depends is really the answer. Alysa warned Brandon that they might be redoing the information when they get to the organization section because city, town, and business belongs in both places and organization sections.
- Alysa also added that with business in the organization section, we do not put in the geographic information. With an organization, it would be the name without the city and state.
- Noel remembers during a previous metadata group meeting that with the organization they would put the name and in parenthesis they would put the place name. This would help distinguish between the organization and the place.
- Alysa looked at the Digital Archives - Organization Entity (Islandora)documentation, and mentioned that it does not make any reference to a geographic reference in an organization name, which is why we are coming to Digital Archive Metadata document to help anyone who is new to the archive figure out how to enter data. We need to decide what the practices are for entering that data.
- Noel pointed out that Mesa County has so many organizations that are mentioned that it becomes valuable distinguishing the geographical locations of each organization (example: Salvation Army (Mesa County), Salvation Army (Montrose)).
- Alysa sees Noel's point because if you think about it from a user's point of view, and what happens in the archive (gathers together like objects), she can see why you would want a separate entity for Salvation Army. She thinks if the group agrees on it, it is not a problem.
- Brandon launched a poll asking the group if they wanted an organization with geolocation going forward.
- Ashley asked if that changes any of the linking that currently exists if the group decides on new standards.
- Brandon responded that anything that currently exists in the archive has not been following these standards. It would not change the object itself it would just change the label on the object. There may be some cases where if we decided to go through and clean this up and change it all over to the new standard there would be some duplicates that need to be cleaned up.
- Noel made one last point using the example of the Fruitvale Lions Club that did a lot of different social work and had its own peculiar history within Mesa County, and that has a different geographic location than a Lions Club somewhere else. We have local entities and organizations that we have written history, and geographical location is important because it is a specific organization. If you do not have the geography of that organization upfront a user may not know the location of that organization.
- Elizabeth put some examples in chat, "Ladies Home League of the Salvation Army (Montrose County, Colorado) VS Ladies Home League of the Salvation Army (Grand Junction, Mesa County, Colorado)" the name is the same, but they are really two different organizations.
  - Noel agreed with Elizabeth to use multiple entities, rather than creating complex child/parent relationships.
- Alysa thought that both Elizabeth and Noel made a great point especially with staff who have never worked in the archive before to easily identify the difference between a place and an organization. Geolocation information is put in place and not necessarily in the organization's name. If you are going to put geographic information in the organization's name, you must always put it in parentheses as our rule. We just need to make sure it looks different than a place, so when we are training staff we can explain the difference very easily.
- Brandon asked if the rivers, lakes, and landmarks changes would be discussed under the places section during this meeting like the business, city, and town.
- Elizabeth replied that the previous conversation about nestling rivers with a parent/child relationship is what started the new conversation about how much work that would be to make sure they are nestled under the thing. It was suggested that Colorado River be an entity and use subject headings to tie everything together instead of relying on the entity.
- Alysa commented that she would use an entity for the Colorado River, USA, and a separate entity for the town of Steamboat and call that good enough. If she wanted to put in an entry that needed more information she would include the Colorado River and their town, she would add the LC Subject Headings in the subject field. She would never create the parent/child relationships because it would be so much work.
- Brandon asked Alysa and Elizabeth to add more information in the Place section about the naming convention for the rivers, lakes, landmarks and highlight it, so the group can talk about it at the next meeting. He thinks that information that is already listed may conflict with the new conversation about how to add place entities. He was unclear about what the group wanted to be listed.
- **Action Item:** Elizabeth will put a note under the rivers, lakes, landmark section to start the decision at the next meeting.

Next Meeting is December 17, 2019, at 1 p.m.