Attendees (16): Suzie Allard, Julia Blixrud, Vinod Chachra, Susan Copeland, Scott Eldredge (financial officer), Ed Fox (director), John Hagen, Thom Hickey, Christine Jewel, Joan Lippincott (host), Austin McLean (treasurer), Gail McMillan (secretary), Ana Pavani, Max Reed, Sharon Reeves, Eric Van de Velde

Teleconference (Skype) participants (8): Denise Bedford, Tony Cargnelutti, William Clark, Bruce Cochran, Eva Müller, Hussein Suleman, Ellen Wagner, Samson Soong

Absentees (3): Jude Edminster, Shilini Urs, Ziaolin Zhang

EF: Welcome (8:30 am)


Review and additions:
- Fair Use and Best Practices for ETDs: Eric and Gail
- European Report: Susan Copeland
- Scandinavian Report: Eva Müller

Minutes NDLTD BoD, June 2, 2008, Aberdeen meeting: accept as presented. EV moved, JH second. All in verbal agreement.

Conference Committee Report (SR) (no written report)

2010 Conference
University of Texas at Austin bid expected soon. JH spoke with Fred Heath, library director, Tim Brace. India/SU mentioned as a possible venue as was Jamaica/Swarna Bandara. Very difficult to get responses to call for Bids.

2011 Conference
Bids are due Jan. 2009.
WC: Ohio State University will bid.
SC: With 3 in a row in the US, we should solicit a wider venue, especially Europe.

2012 Conference
When should bids for 2012 go out?
After 2009 symposium and 2010 and 2011 are committed.
JH: Need to mentor conference hosts
SR: Hong Kong would be a good venue. Is SS amenable?

EF: Motion to accept probable bid from Texas?
GMc: Accept a reasonable bid.
SR: It will be reasonable, comprehensive.
JH: Texas DL is participating in the UT conference bid.
SA: Moved that Conference Committee be authorized to accept Texas bid.
EV: 2nd
All in favor
SR: Brisbane Tourist Bureau solicited our business.
Consensus: Not appropriate without a university with ETDs as a partner.

EF: HS has facilitated a chat discussion among Skype participants. EW is trying to get in too.

**Treasurer’s Report--Budget Discussion (SE, AMc)**

SE: Detailed review. Good news: all is good. No new expenses –same as previous years. Largest membership (65), but lost ADT. Balance is currently $51,807.78. Fewer scholarships, more next year for Pittsburgh travel scholarships.

JH: 2009 Conference: University of Pittsburgh and WVU have contributed $15,000 seed money for scholarships. Would the NDLTD Board be willing to match? Needed particularly for Developing Nations’ participants. IFLA is sponsoring 2 attendees.

SC: Budget from ETD 2008 may give back some money $5,000. Will be January before she can confirm.

AMc: We have had budget surpluses. Let’s think about how we can increase our contributions in strategic areas and in conference scholarships. Brainstorm for matching grants or other ways to increase conference participation.

SA: Let’s think about travel scholarships that would encourage new institutional memberships.

EV: Agrees, but caution re economy. We need to prepare for the worst-case-scenario and the conference running a deficit. Recent economic history has taught that contingencies would be good and having reserve funds would be wise.

SR: Outside venues are more expensive than being hosted by universities.

EF: Reports from travel awardees. Did we hear back from them?
SC: Hasn’t received any written reports, but did not ask for any. Received email of thanks. She’s still in touch with recipients.

SR: It is a requirement for travel awardees to submit reports. She has a list for a few previous years and she’ll get Aberdeen names. We have not been successful in receiving what we say is a requirement for the scholarship.

JB: Could we use these reports for PR? Even a few sentences would spread the enthusiasm.

SC: Report on which sessions attended would not be very useful.

AP: Libio from Peru received a scholarship and now the LA consortium has grown and is receiving multimedia.

GMc: Would Libio host a conference in Peru?
EF: Portfolio of people’s testimonials might help gain corporate sponsorship. Start a Blog with these. At CNI Educause interviewed 10-20 people for a podcast. We could do this also at our conferences. Easy to do with MP3 recorder and file. Conference Committee should think about doing this.

EF: Are we in favor of $15,000 total contribution to conference support?
TH: In favor.
EV: The motion is to give $15,000 (increase by $10,000 the suggested amount)
SC: $5,000 from Aberdeen
EF: May come into the NDLTD budget for appropriate use.
TH: What is a typical travel grant?
JH: $3500—including US visa, etc.
EF: No objections? Board approves.
SE: Web maintenance question: $3,000 allocated. Has it been used? Should we include again in next year’s budget? Same question for PR support for SA.
SA: Used $2,000 in student support for PR. She will need additional support to continue. Advertising campaign would come next.
SR: Give $2,000 to SA for student wages.
JL: 2nd
JH: Very worthwhile investment, especially since we have no full time staff.
HS: He doesn’t need funding for web maintenance. He mostly needs content for the NDLTD web.
JH: Awards Committee may impact.
EF: Accept budget with changes discussed.
SR 2nd.
EF: Call for comments
AMc: We’ll still have $45,000 without $3,000 to HS, plus income from last conference potentially.
EF: No opposition.

Nominations Committee (CJ)
http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/NDLTD/BoD200812/NominatingComReport_fall08_draft.pdf
Committee is composed of SA, CJ, JL, PS, EV. Welcomed new Board members: Max Reed and Bruce Cochrane. 27 Board members currently. At the ETD 2009 board meeting nine members’ terms will expire. Suggested candidates? Let CJ know.
JH: Rush Miller, U Pitt nominated.
SR: We need more international memberships. Our international members need to recruit for us.
AP: SE suggested Spanish-speaking member would be important.
EV: Do we know if any of the 9 does not want to continue?
CJ: SA, DB, TC, VC, JH, SR, PS, SS, EW—these terms will end.
EF: Let’s recruit nominees even if current members want to continue.
CJ: Will inquire those who want to continue on the Nominating Committee.
EF: Nominating Committee should send call to the ETD-L, show our openness to participation.
CJ: Terms are not balanced. 12 terms will expire in 2010. 2011 only 6 terms will expire. Possibly we could ask board members to step down to be renominated immediately.
GMc: As long as there’s some staggering of terms, we’re OK.
EF: EV will look at Bylaws for next meeting’s discussion.
EW: Can we tie conference promotion to web development?
EF: We need to include testimonials, pod casts, etc. in the web like our award.
EW: Adobe and others need to see why they should continue to fund our awards.

Awards Committee (CJ, JH) (no written report)
They’re working on funding for the 2009 conference. Asked for $8500 for all awards, a bit higher than previously—from Adobe. Also asking Scirus. Is anything available from NDLTD budget?
JH: Awards Committee changed from $300 to $80 0 to each graduate student. Adobe committed $5000. Now total costs are $8000 to cover increase in student awards. Recurring problem though always has been successful.
EW: Adobe probably won’t contribute this year. Last few years, after Macromedia acquiring, changed educational goals of Adobe. She’s not part of education team, and they are not opposed to NDLTD award, but they need to see direct relationship. What can we do to take back to Adobe the exciting ETD work being done?
JH: Glen McCandless promoted. We have student testimonials from award winners. They are online.
EW: She has seen these and will share the information. Being held accountable—telling the Adobe story. We need to tell the story—help Adobe tell the story. Megan ________, Ed at Adobe with CJ and JH come up with a plan and more info on NDLTD web site—more united way.
SA: What are the key areas for Adobe’s development?
EW: Can help with this since she can speak both sides—Adobe education development and NDLTD.
SA: Will help with student support.
EF: Task force with SA, EW, JH.
JH: This is the awards committee work.
EF: Let’s hear back in a few months.

JH: Elsevier/Scirus: He’s trying to get their attention. He’ll keep plugging away. Has many medallions.
CJ: Awards Committee will send out call for nominations.
SA: Suggests that the call not include the amount. No false promises.
JH: Outreach: we’re not reaching Graduate Schools that know the outstanding ETDs. Let’s make contacts with the CGS here and abroad. Can VC and TH look for ETDs that aren’t PDF?
CJ: We’ll follow up on the Board’s listserv—to attract more nominations.
SR: Vary the amount of awards and/or reduce the number of awards. If funding does not come through from a sponsor, the NDLTD Board should contribute $5000.
EF: Without funding from Adobe, it won’t be the Adobe award, of course.

Denise Bedford joined at 9:47 am via telephone.

Union Catalog Reports (TH and VC)
TH: OCLC continues to harvest metadata for ETDs, circa 700,000. Also looks for URLs to be resolved which reduces the number by perhaps 100,000. Many from Australia are also leaving.
AP: Brazilian perspective: She contacts managers of Brazilian Consortium: ABICT. Looking for error reports to reconcile.
TH: We’re glad to look into these.
EV: If we play our cards right, major positive publicity can come from our hitting the one million mark.
TH: We must be careful because 150,000-200,000 are dupes.
EV: We have to monitor it right?
GMc: VT may not be updating WorldCat even though we are scanning theses and dissertations. [VT Cataloging does not update WorldCat records for scanned TDs (may start fall ’09).]

VC: Collection stats and usage stats of VTLS NDLTD catalog.
http://rogers.vtls.com:6080/visualizer/
Harvesting OCLC data 766,636 ETDs most with URLs. Language breakdown included. Surprise 7,794 from Lithuania. Undetermined: 5,004 lack language codes.
EF: Could we report this information back to the institutions?
VC: Yes, we can give the list of institutions. Country breakdown included also. Hong Kong: 16,000 was a surprise. African ETDs lack full work, just summary documents. Data by date of publication: back to 1940s. Oldest was 1901 from MIT, Architecture. Handwritten 5-page dissertation. Learn more about it in Wikipedia. More Google analytics are available too. Oct/Nov. more than 10,000 visits. Usage stats are somewhat surprising. Average time: >8 minutes from Africa where network speed is so slow and this may explain duration of visit. 70% from referring sites. 30% direct traffic. >2% from Google/search engines. Referring sites, e.g., NDLTD web site.
Answers it would be good to have:
1: How many contain multimedia? If this isn’t in the metadata, someone will need to crawl for this info—a few days for script/program writing.
2: Do you want to do an opinion poll for visitors?
3: The one million mark should be addressed, as EV suggested.
AP: Q for VC Portuguese languages—where are these hits coming from if not Brazil?
VC: Several from North America, some from Europe. Many dissertations written in NA have dual language codes. They deal with Portuguese Content, not just Portuguese language. Coding needs be done to clean up this data. He needs volunteers to do this.
EV: In a federated situation, we must rely on cataloging.
VC: People in South American were using a language code that confused things. Changed language translations tables, not metadata.
EF: Question re Spanish language ETDs
AP: They are coming from Peru, Puebla…
EF: There should be more Spanish works.
AP: Maybe they are written in English.

EF: Read HS’s chat: African ETDs are not correct.
EF: Observations: average time is valuable to tease out further—histogram. Question re number of downloads.
VC: No, that comes from another site.
EF: Multimedia content information would be valuable.
TH: Yes, OCLC will do this.
EF: The number of data sets would be good to know also.
TH: Will get stats re duplicates.
JL: VC raised the Question about survey data popups. Let’s think about this from a PR standpoint. Collecting data for a short period of time.
EF: Ask who are you: scientist, grad student, business? What sector do you come from? What use will you make of the ETD? Perception is that ETDs are not valuable for their content. Can we work on this message? Types of users from what sectors for what purpose? Global perspective will be good. Brief survey in a short period of time.
VC: Stats accessed from Google Map for 2 month reporting period. 552 from China (visits)—greatly reduced number because they are harvesting internally and not letting outsiders (e.g., OCLC) harvest their metadata.
EF: SS can we get help from you and from NDLTD Board member from China.
EF: Summer student project independent study re Indian sites with ETDs. Found only a small number. There are works out that were not available through OAI. VC’s data from India is not in Top 10.
VC: He has more details than top 10, he can email when he gets home. To get more ETDs from India people at universities are not aware of NDLTD. They need to become members.
JH: India (SU) needs to host NDLTD.
VC: New Delhi, Bangalore, or Hyderabad area would be best venues for hosting NDLTD. SU could help with Bangalore and Mysore.
EF: SU and/or VC could work on approaching Indian institutions re NDLTD membership.
JH: Yes, and Conference Committee.
EF: I’d like to see a workshop in India before there is a conference there.
SA: It is very useful to build on local work, such as workshops, before hosting full conference.
EF: SU cannot be the lone individual and be successful at planning/hosting an ETD conference.
VC: IT societies group is in DC. Send them publicity: Ban IIT. Meeting in March.
SA: We need to develop India-centric materials. Sales pitch could be outside member on an TD committee. Sends by post. Therefore, getting outside members would be very beneficial if ETD not paper.
EF: Thanks, VC for leading this initiative. Thanks to VTLS and OCLC.

Break: 10:20 -10:35 am

Timothy Dellyannides, UPitt joined via Skype.

ETD 2009 Conference Report
TD: On track so far. Website is fleshed out for now. Give him feed back on Contact Us link. Scholarship info will be done by end of Dec. Full registration will be available by first week in Feb. Will add bios and pictures of keynote speakers. Paper submission is using Open Conference …

Still early yet. All conf. venues have been booked. All are within ½ block of the Cathedral of Learning, i.e., center of campus. Very convenient venue. All meeting space, registration, vendors in one building. Across the street for lunches. Night reception in conf. room of Cathedral of Learning, a gothic stone space. Budget: developed and pretty firm: $160,000. Assume 300 attendees, a big increase from 2008, anticipating a big US attendance. $400/person early, $500 late reg. $5000 committed from WVU and Pitt for travel scholarships. Fund raising goal of $30,000. If we meet these goals: Conference banquet Thursday night. Riverboat cruise on Friday night—dance band. ProQuest committed $20,000. (Applause/thank you from NDLTD Board) Any surplus will go to scholarship. Anticipating 3-4 scholarships.

JH: Open Society Institute has sponsored previously. He expects to hear soon. ExLibris will get a 2nd tier sponsorship.

TD: Director of Development is working on this. He expects to exceed the goals, and reduce conference registration rate.

VC: Is there a guest registration rate?

TD: Yes, just recover costs for dinners.

EV: Discount for NDLTD members?

JH: Yes, up to organizers. Last year: 8%—about $40.


TD: 10% would be easier.

EF: Travel freezes at many institutions. How will we adjust if registration is down?

TD: Highest costs are food. Venues are not that expensive. If we have a smaller number, the bill will be lower. There is wiggle room.

TD: We have a line item. He will do a reality check. University should charge less than a hotel would.

EF: Union issues sometimes effect costs.

JH: All activities are on campus.

TD: Buses to riverboat cruise and Saturday alternate activities. Other things are walking distance.

JH: Sponsors will cover dinners, coffee breaks, etc. and travel awards. Added a technology fair for open source and commercial vendors, especially IR systems available for hands-on demos.

VC: VTLS will participate.

AMc: Suggests pricing at $395, not $400. Maybe $345 for members.

JH: Additional conference sponsorship will reduce costs.

SC: Email re European digital library conference matches our dates and is already advertising. We need to get the ETD 2009 info out ASAP.

EW joined via Skype again at 10:52.

TD: Registration now scheduled to open March 2. Will try and move it up. Would February 1 be better?

As early as possible.


EV: Peter Jaszi, from American University.

JL: Very good speaker too.

JH: Deanna Marcum from LoC is coming.

JL: IP is not DM’s area.

EF: JCDL conference follows ours immediately. TD could you contact them about joint publicity. Let’s update the conference web site ASAP.

TD: See related conferences: JCDL, ALA, Open Repositories on NDLTD conference website.

EF: Thanks for being so well organized at this stage of the process.
TD: We are really happy to host the ETD conference.

**Hong Kong Report (SS)**  

Lots of progress and EF feels it could be model for the region. Five require e-submission, three have open access. Too many librarians, but we don’t want people to think they are the only ones interested in ETDs. Committee and faculty and other researchers are interested in Open Access also.

EF: We hope Hong Kong will be a model for others in Asia. We’re anxious to hear more about the bibliometrics if possible.

**Sweden Report (EM) (no written report)**  
~48,000 undergraduate ETDs, only 8 research universities for doctorates.

EF: Thanks for your report, please send Gail summary for minutes. Wow! 40k EUTs (Electronic Undergraduate Theses)—

EM: Will send link to EUTs.

EF: This is an important extension of our efforts.

EM: Quite successful because it helps administration of the process for both teachers and students. It’s more practical.

EF: To move more in this direction: metadata, workflow, etc. considerations. Conference presentations would be good.

EM: Will ask someone from National Library to consider giving a presentation. 47,948 EUTs, actually.

VC: Data is sparse but is available in union catalogs.

SR: She was asked whether Theses Canada would accept undergraduate research reports, Deans said no.

GMc: Some EUTs are better than some master’s theses. Honors Program at VT interested in having EUTs available in ETD database. Have also added some Bachelor’s of Architecture theses.

SR: Honors Theses but perhaps not Research Reports.

VC: Should we add facets for undergrad, masters, doctorates, others?

EF: Let’s include all works that related to ETDs. Different institutions will use different labels. Include all theses, dissertations and other terms. Proper tagging is important for search engines distinguishing among them. Standards Committee and Union Catalog Committee will work on these issues. Let’s empower undergraduates. EPortfolios!

AP: We already discussed this when we revised our metadata schema last June.

EF: EM thank you.

**South Africa Report (HS)**  

Worked with smaller institutions to get national agency to host in DSpace: pilots are almost functional. National portal soon. Every institution will eventually participate. Then we will move on to neighboring countries.

EW and BC are still connected.

EW: Sponsorship and funding issues at Adobe already discussed. She’s learning a lot. Planning on staying online for a few more hours—as long as possible.

BC: Learning a lot by listening. Will be back about 2 pm.

**Latin America Report (AP)**  

Most institutions are not offering their metadata for harvesting. She has been trying to work with Chile unsuccessfully. Venezuela has almost 10,000 ETDs so they will join us soon. Mexico is not organized.
nationally—instiutions are all separate. Do you have other suggestions? Otherwise she will keep working as she has.

JH: Kudos for LA news bulletin.

AP: Gabriel ____________ sent email from IBICT re lack of validation.

EF: Following links from report sometimes lead to nothing.

TH: He doesn’t check.

EF: Does the metadata record have a URL? Does the URL lead to anything?

TH: Not always easy to see, as Scirus found. Links can link to splash page or request for a password, etc.

VC: We can do a 404 check, but otherwise very difficult.

AP: We receive a report that says the records are not valid.

EF: We’ll resolve this somehow. We need a white paper re quality ETD records—metadata, URLs that point to valid destinations.

AP: Sometimes servers are down. They need to be up 24/7. This is a different type of problem.

Concerning Brazilian records. Not 58,000 are broken links as report suggests. Australasian records are similarly misleading.

EF: Marcos Gonsalvas is also in Brazil. Perhaps he could help AP with IBICT for quality improvement activities for NDLTD. This would be a very nice model for us to have.

AP: She’ll contact MG as soon as she returns.

SE: Received a request from Argentina to join.

AP: Therefore we’ll have more Spanish records.

European Report (SC) (no written report)

Amalgamation: Guide and Dart Europe are a single group for European activities, now called Dart Europe and endorsed by European research libraries group www.dart-europe.eu Very active organizations. She’s very hopeful about their participation—will publicize NDLTD awards and perhaps nominate someone for the NDLTD Board.

AP: Ask for Iberian language speaker!

SC: Also German National Library, a strong lineup. European portal for ETDs is good. Still working on features, e.g., searching by institution and language. This will be a continuing service.

EF: Are all 96,000 ETDs being gathered into the metadata/union catalog? Who will follow up?

SC: Will take it to DART-Europe.

TH: We can set up a European harvest, rather than going to the individual institutions. And, some are coming in through WorldCat.

SC: On the UK site, Ethos service soft launch scheduled for yesterday. Full launch with media is in Jan.

EV: Will help with Flemish ETDs from Belgium. He will send her the contact.

SC: Will send Gail notes for her report/minutes.

ETD-MS Report (TH, AP)


Tagging for Union Catalog

EF: Scirus needs to know about changes.

TH: In Aberdeen we agreed on 3 changes: (1) specific levels of theses (0 = pre masters, 1 = pre doctorals, 2 = doctors), (2) access levels, (3) country of publication. HS set it up so TH could edit on the NDLTD web site so new version. HS, AP, GMc, and TH were the main people who worked on this. As soon as they review it, it will be published live. TH hasn’t looked at all the XML issues. Then we will try and get the European perspective on this and fold it in. Limited Aberdeen discussion, not aware of any show stoppers. Everyone seems to have very reasonable ideas on what needs to be done. He had no trouble editing the NDLTD web site. Thanks to HS for that.

AP: After the model is finished we need to have a time frame for other institutions to data model and get provider systems ready.

TH: They are all backward compatible. Also include clarifications, e.g., identifying the level of the ETD.
EF: We need to get the word out widely after phase testing.
TH: Board will be notified next.

VC: It is coming from the metadata.
EF: Would Adobe need additional info?
EW: Corporate sponsorship or others do not necessarily see the value. We need to give them the words about the added value, connect the dots for them.

BC is off audio connection but is keeping chat open.
EW and HS are still connected, and Denise by telephone.

**ETD_db report (GMc)**
Rewritten software will have more options for browsing, timed release of restricted etc – which automates individual manual release. This is free software available from VT ETD homepage:
http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/ Still includes automated email to author and advisor about approvals, etc. If you have HR system like Banner ETD_db will link so most fields will be filled-in and students only have to complete a few fields, such as access level and copyright. Testing in early Feb so it can be rolled out for spring submissions but it may be held until summer. [Vacancy in DLA Systems Administrator position so no rewrite of ETD_db schedule at this time: 5/26/09]

**MetaArchive Report (GMc)**

Rice and Boston College joined NDLTD based on MetaArchive (with reduced membership fees). 30 participants in Aberdeen ETD Preservation Workshop. Lithuania and Brazil likely to join. Most institutions want to join at high level of participation—Sustaining Members. PUC Rio and Lithuania will likely join as Contributing Members and we’re looking forward to testing these service activities. We will do another preconference ETD Preservation Workshop at Pitt next June, following model of the one we did last June in Aberdeen. This is really helping with preservation plan for ETDs. MetaArchive is an NDIIP initiative, but LoC continues to support MetaArchive’s efforts even when its general funding declined.
Board applauded upon conclusion!

Lunch break: 12:05 pm. Reconvened at 12:55 pm

JH showed the video from OCLC Midwinter [2008] Symposium: “New Leadership for New Challenges” at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Is0BYC7EhM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Is0BYC7EhM)

EF: How can we partner with others to share the benefits of the NDLTD?
JH: Does anyone have connections with IFLA?
SR, AMc responded: Yes
JL: At this table we can see that we have been extremely effective in partnering. We have global relationships, not confined to just higher education institutions but other companies and institutions. Not a problem to be solved. Our communication strategy is our major weakness. Robust information is essential. We don’t have a viable strategy because we have had access for 6 months to improve the NDLTD web site and it hasn’t happened. We are not clear about what resources are available.
DB: Could work with SA and her student to get the word out, what the World Bank can contribute.
VC: We need links to success stories. It needs to be linked from the web site as well as at the conferences.
AMc: Membership renewals could be an opportunity to support as a result of tangible successes. Perhaps EV’s renewal letter could be beefed up.
SA: Strategic Communication Plan doesn’t match where we want to be, but where we have been. Communication needs to meet the strategic vision. We need more online NOW, e.g., different target audiences but we haven’t figured out how to address them.

AMc: Two major constituencies: new to ETDs and experienced ETD initiatives that want to expand, e.g., Multimedia. How are we meaningful to them both?

GMc: Preservation and Fair Use are important to communicate.


EV: Per JL and the video, NDLTD is healthy in the network sense, but the members are in turmoil and crisis now and next 20 years: What does it mean to be a library re cheap downloadable books? Why bother with site licenses rather individual subscriptions? Why are librarians in the middle? These are organizational challenges to electrifying the paper processes. Perhaps we could set NDLTD as a partner, bridging the crisis, to help organizations to deal with issues such as archival functions of ETDs.

TH: Consortia subscriptions will increase in his opinion.

EV: Campus site licenses don’t necessarily address the needs of the loan researcher.

JL: Immediate--website needs to be more robust for current and future members. Will draft enhancements needed that will get input and prepare a 2-page draft for a freelance consultant to suggest whether we can afford her.

EF: Yes, but we have to do our part—keeping it up to date day-to-day and ongoing.

JL: One possibility would be to find someone to get us back on the right footing. 2x year review of web so communications committee can evaluate and act on needs.

AP: We have to decide what we want.

SC: Ongoing: statistics are needed to make the case. People are still referring to the circulation statistics from Virginia Tech.

SA: We need to present more than data, but what is the story that the data tells? We need to tell this effectively. We have different messages: learn how to build a digital library or institutional repository for ETDs, and a message to students about getting their research recognized. Compare to YouTube—share your research: it’s the same emotion. The faculty is a holding-back point, some are unwilling to work with students anxious to do ETDs. Library systems and nontechnical people aren’t necessarily connecting. Story telling is extremely important. We haven’t done a good job of identifying what story we want to tell. We may need concentrated time.

GMc: Following the conference so we can include evaluations of conference.

SA or earlier, before conf.

AP: Most universities think after they set up the ETD, they’re finished. But they don’t evolve and think they don’t need NDLTD to continue. New functions need to be added, statistics, languages, etc. to keep current. Preservation information. Learn how to keep awareness current and future oriented.

VC: Several simultaneous story lines: student, faculty, library, country. Content story line: what do you do with various types of ETDs, data across institutions. What about access and preservation—make access easier, e.g., slow networks in Africa. We could identify with differing constituencies.

AMc: More than turning paper into electronic. Communicate the future of the NDLTD and its importance to the universities that are members and those who may join.

EF: We have much to reflect on: Positive: we’re positioned well with a fundamental and valuable core. Uploading, browsing, etc. We are the ultimate horizontal organization, and vertical from students to faculty to graduate school and library and IT. Sharing information also. The challenge is to make people aware of this. Fundamentally we’re serving a community of people who will do these things. We need to keep their attention by adding services and continuing to innovate. Every piece of what we do is relevant, but we need to tell our story in different ways so that different constituencies see how we are relevant to them, supported by data and statistics.

AMc: We need to tell our tremendous success story. We are a victim of our success. Now we need to articulate the next phase of the ETD transition story. Paint the picture of what we’re working on and how we are relevant.
EF: Crossover is our appeal.
EV: Laval accepts other formats. Germany?
TH: What about marking up PDF files?
VC: Rendering engine for XML files.
SA: Challenges of our organization: we’re hitting boundaries of different disciplines.
EV: This could be a strength.
SA: Different levels: innovators need to hear different stories, but the bulk of our audience needs to hear about PDFs.
TH: This is not a problem—vanilla PDFs.
EV: Our role is to look ahead to the next generation of ETDs and their authors.
JL: Scholarly communications issues—very traditional expectations by the disciplines. Let’s highlight innovation.
SC: Two goals: enhancements to existing ETD initiatives and those beginning their ETD initiatives.
SA: We don’t want to lose our base, i.e., ETD initiatives just beginning.
EF: We have a broad vision. Construct a large audit instrument: assess these issues—awareness of DL, open access, scholarly communication. How does their institution support this? What extent does their ETD collection support this? This instrument would sharpen or focus our vision. May demonstrate that the vision is not meeting expectations.
EV: We want to demonstrate the benefits of ETDs [and NDLTD].
EF: Let’s articulate these issues and point to them.

VC left at 1:45

JH: What studies are there of Open Access to ETDs? Is there a parallel like the one Steven Harnad found re open access ejournals?
BC joined via Skype: 1:45.

DB still on the telephone. Agrees with SA’s description of the challenge and where we really need to start.
EF: Actions? Half-day retreat before our next board meeting.
SR: Enthusiastically supports this opportunity to look at our strategic goals.
AP: Let’s draft the topics critical to this discussion.
JL: We should write these for the BoD meeting. Country reports don’t need to take as much time so that we could devote more to strategic initiatives.
JH: June 9th, day before the conf starts is devoted to the Board.
EF: Start at noon on June 8th for retreat, leaving 9th to reports, committees. How do we prepare for this?
SA: To focus the retreat: First identify deliverables by a small group and present to the whole in plenary. Will tell us what we are and what there is to do. Small groups can hammer out the details.
SR: Website may roll out smoothly once we figure out how to tell our story. Gap analysis would follow on strategic analysis.
EV: Write a 1-2 page position paper by the end of Jan or Feb. General preparation for the retreat.
EV: We have a wiki.
EF: Will give GMc a list of issues: Strategic plan to include vision goals objectives audit document to allow assessment in different areas. Web site to match the object. Staffing organization plan to achieve objectives. Partnering on areas of the stories. Priorities. Address communities.
SA: Add the process to get there. Start with Delphi. Break into groups on the topics. Fair amount of work to be done ahead of time to have a productive retreat.
EF: Current committee structure or different groupings.
SR: Let’s see what comes out of one-pagers.
CJ: Wants to address more than just the committees’ work she is responsible for.
SA: Will have a chance to give ideas to other areas at larger group meetings.
EF: Recap re strategic planning discussion [above]. How do we get the Delphi process started?

JL: Consultant discussed earlier could help us with results of strategic planning discussion.

JB: Issue based discussion will come from Delphi. Committees are operationally focused. We need higher level preparation for retreat.

SA: Volunteered to get us started. Delphi process for top five ideas, strategic plan for vision, goals, objectives, audit plan, staffing organizational plan, partnering with section of stories, action plans with priorities. Suggest process be Delphi, create committees, discuss and create straw man (with input from all who are interested), bring straw man for discussion.

EF: That’s our plan. SA and her student will help us start the Delphi process and identifying the stages so that we get to the retreat with the correct information in hand.

DB: Volunteered to help.

EV: Cal Tech has been discussing this re justifying institutional repositories. Therefore, he is willing to help too.

General agreement on the process suggestion.

EF: Returning to JL’s comments re web site improvements. In parallel with strategic thinking. Invite consultant to come to our meeting.

JL: Envisions a rough outline of what we might want for the two key audiences: new to ETDs and established programs to move to another level. What resources can we provide them: software, tools, catalogs, stories, data that will help them in their institutional efforts. Not every part of the web site, but focus on these. She will write a basic outline of categories and types of resources existing and to be developed. We will give input. She will arrange a phone call or meeting with possible consultant to help operationalize it.

JL: Rush Miller, UPitt, may be a facilitator? Communication strategies need to be heard first hand and would help if the consultant were present.

EF: Web site—survey of what is of interest to people at different levels—address their interests and their needs.

JL: Needs assessment is a better strategy than just a survey.

GMc: Query the ETD-L.

SA: We will also have an audience at the conference we can poll.

AP: Who are the NDLTD web site visitors? Countries?

JL: Is HS collecting stats? From where?

TC: We want to know why people don’t go there but should also.

EF: SA is leading this effort in sync with JL. Our organization’s goals and objectives move us beyond what ETDs have already accomplished. We want to make sure that we are meeting the needs of current, past, and future members. How can we involve ADT back into the NDLTD.

TC: IR service may be of particular interest.

TC: Harvesting protocol has changed from 2005 from harvesting from national bibliographic DB—just records, not pointers to ETDs because they didn’t exist then. Now all ETDs generated are electronic. Harvesting is only picking up ETDs—16,000 in national database. Other 21, 000 had ETDs attached. Will do future investigation. Will talk to TH about being sure the ADT ETDs are getting harvested.

TC: ADT is well established at the universities. Only a handful to bring on board still. Stick and carrot with national government.

http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/NDLTD/BoD200812/Australasia200812.pdf
EF: Our most broadly engaged board meeting to date.

EF: Data sets in sciences, but also cultural heritage. Demonstrates how we could tell our story too.

JH: We have a board meeting room reserved? Is this sufficient?

SA: Can we break into small groups also?

EF: Working lunch but out for dinner. As we prepare for the retreat, look at NDLTD history.

JH: History of NDLTD. He’s been involved in the Science and Technology group in ALA so he prepared history of ETDs in the US, from our web site but 10-year gap. Will get our input and add to the website. [http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses_1/NDLTD/BoD200812/Hagen_History_of_NDLTD.pdf](http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses_1/NDLTD/BoD200812/Hagen_History_of_NDLTD.pdf)

EF: There’s a IR brainstorming session for JISC and DARTEurope to connect us to them more strongly.

Committee Reports

**Standards Committee (SR) (no written report)**

SR: ORE (Open Archives Initiative Object Reuse and Exchange) presentation at CNI: (Herbert Van de Somple): not exactly an extension of OAI PMH. Technical experts have developed a way to map interconnected resources on the web, based on web architecture, which doesn’t really recognize logical connections the way people do. They have created a way to do resource mapping of multiple objects. It could be very useful to multimedia publications, like ETDs with pdfs, videos, etc., being brought together with persistent identifiers. He presented first operational strategy available for others to begin to use.

AP: Also heard the ORE presentation: saw potential of grouping contents that could make up courseware—to order them. We can think of ETDs as part of bigger projects, courses. Wants to know if they have experimented with courseware.

TH: Cautionary note. Jeff Young, at OCLC, has been involved in architectural committee. He’s become less enthusiastic as time goes on. The RDF (Resource Description Framework) camp think that its overarchitected and more complex. A more web friendly way may exist, e.g., with HTTP, etc.

EV: Good to be aware of ORE without jumping on the bandwagon. PDF/A: parsing is difficult. Linking and embedding are issues. ProQuest is accepting PDF/A from McGill.

EF: Conference planners might have a session to talk about these issues.

GMc: NDLTD could offer training for PDFA due to its community’s experience with it. More reliable long term format

SR: McGill is accepting only PDF/A.

GMc: Can’t have links to external files, base 14 fonts only, etc. This limits what can be included.

AMc: Will help us learn who is involved, what community it is, etc.

EF: Suggests for conference that there be a session on packaging.

SR: University of Saskatchewan had a web site and can’t harvest more—just PDF. The website is now commercial. Does the university have an original copy?

EF: Packaging and preservation are important topics, e.g., games. We need to stay on top of this.

**EV: Fair Use**

GMc and EV attended CNI session re Fair Use by Peter Jaszi, law professor at American University. He promoted Fair Use as not an archaic set of guidelines. Courts put a lot of weight on consensus practices within the professions. If we put together our practices for ETDs, the courts would recognize that as precedent. Have prepared guidelines for documentary filmmakers. Practices with ETDs would be a way to define fair use for our professional organization. For example, scanning old theses—is it necessary to get permissions from these authors to post them online? We could define fair
use within our application if we get consensus. We don’t need to be hamstrung by rules that applied to the paper world.

TC: The ADT had much discussion about 3rd party copyright. Consensus was not to have to get authors permission.
EV: Nervous litigious society. Jaszi could help with knowing what the rules are.
WC: Copyright to one side. The big research institutions, Intellectual Property and proprietary issues are major. Could we bring together legal representatives from a few institutions to discuss ETDs?
EV: New vs. old works are different issues. Tracking authors is time consuming.
WC: Thesis is an examination document in which the university has some ownership and therefore stake in distribution/dissemination.
JL: Jaszi referred to 3 sets of guidelines. We could have these issues on the NDLTD website. We could help them find the resources and we can add resources from outside the US.
EV: Jaszi is looking for different communities to look at fair use issues.
EF: Let’s focus on community needs and best practices and innovations.

Susanna Dobrats joined in person at 3 pm.

SR: Copyright at NDLTD could be handled like the creative commons.
EF: Map of the world with links to copyright resources.
SC: Rather than by topics, use Creative Commons to identify a country’s initiatives.
AP: The problem is more complicated.
EV: Open access ETDs.
TH: Separate issue of who has copyright.
EV: Rights of the institution to make ETDs available.
JL: Separate issues: fair use of inclusion of copyrighted works within one’s work. What are the IP issues in scanning print TDs?
EV: The CNI session was an eye-opener. He will read up on Jaszi’s work.
EF: Who is interested?
GMc will work with EV.
TC: Will leave us for his work at 7 am his time.

PR Committee (SA): Nothing more. (no written report)
Implementation Committee (JH) (no written report)
Nothing new. Announced plans for preconference: ETDs for Rookies.
Membership Committee (EV) (no written report)
List handed out with SE’s list of institutions who made payments. Let’s buy some membership software to make management more professional. He looked at open source, but didn’t find anything very good. Some inexpensive (few hundred dollars) e.g., update address, etc. Will look into this and request board’s approval by email and will mount on Cal Tech Server.
SC: Calendar year vs. academic year payments effect the list of members.
AMc: 5% discount confirmed via email—for joint MetaArchive and NDLTD members.
EF: We’ve covered the agenda.
SA: Executive Committee?
EF: How to move forward? Delphi study we discussed earlier?
SR: Conference Standing Committee. There hasn’t been continuity from past to future conference planning until she took ownership. It fits her skill set too. Brief flings with other committees were
unsuccessful. Plus the volunteer factor we all have to deal with. Chairing a committee you must feel this sense of ownership or the organization suffers.

EF: Perhaps we need similar overlap that we now have to standing vs. annual conference planning committee. We could also engage more people this way.

CJ: Awards Committee could use additional members. Co-chairing with experienced chair first help tremendously. Evaluating in particular was an issue.

SC will rejoin.

SR: Put out a call on the ETD-L.

EF: Let’s ask winners to join the Awards Committee.

SC: Let’s use people who have already volunteered as well, e.g., Charles Greenberg (Yale) and David Lawrence (Sweden). Lessons learned: She will add lessons learned from the Aberdeen conference to the NDLTD web site. For example, reassure future conference hosts may not realize how much help is available for chairing sessions and interviewing speakers.

SR: Could add this information to the conference bid information, i.e., that the Board will assist.

MR: Will talk to JL and SA to help with repurposing the website and filling it out. It ties in with what she is doing at UBC grad studies. She pointed out that we use lots of acronyms.

BC: He echoes MR’s sentiments. He hasn’t been involved with ETDs since the Petersburg, Florida, ETD conference. Wants to learn more about Fair Use. Offers to help with future annual conferences once he’s experienced one of ours. It’s been a great day.

Fair Use Committee: EV, GMc, BC.

WC: Fair Use comments. Ohio St. U. attorney, Steve McDonald, expert on Internet legal issues including ETDs. We should bring him into this discussion, speaker at a conference.

EF: Thanks for everybody’s participation in this meeting and their ongoing efforts on behalf of the NDLTD. Happy Holidays, too.

SR: Creative Writing Survey?

JH: No news from Jill Kleister.

EF: DINI certification? Invited SD to retreat on June 8th. Scope of our objectives is very broad.

SD: Would like to help with this activity re DINI. (http://www.dini.de) Organizational issues seem to be more important than the technological ones.

EF: Accreditation is being discussed too.

SD: Will draft ideas about what could be audited.

EF: We want an institution interested in NDLTD to see a road map of progress. Audit could give a score in each area. Mature institutions may actually be flunking in some areas.

SD: In Europe they have a cooperation between German, British, Danish, Dutch research organizations on a small ETD project and ORE metadata set. Does this appeal to NDLTD?

EF: Conference could have a panel about packaging where ORE discussion could fit, e.g., 200 files in website, organic rather than well organized. We want to hear more about such activities.

WC: 2011 conference bid may arrive early next year. New library is about to open and would be a wonderful space to meet. (Joe Brandon, library director at OSU).

EF: Oct. 14th was Open Access Day. Let’s prepare for next year.

EV: How about a YouTube video?

EF: Get someone from broader community.

GMc: Charles Greenberg?

JH: Will contact him.

JL: Sent JH email re fliers for CNI meeting distribution. Where else could we distribute them?

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.