

Transcript Summary 4 Sunday Discussion

**Workshop on User-Centered Design of Language Archives
20-21 February 2016
Co-Organizers: Christina Wasson and Gary Holton**

Transcription by Heather Roth

15 July 2016

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grants No. BCS-1543763 and BCS-1543828.

The material is available for use under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.



Document Information	
Title	Transcript Summary 4: Sunday Discussion
Author(s)	Christina Wasson, Gary Holton, Heather Roth
Original Creation Date	15 July 2016
Version	1.0
Date of Current Version	15 July 2016
Revised By	
Description	Transcript of fourth part of Workshop on User-Centered Design of Language Archives, held 20-21 February 2016 at UNT
Rights Information	© Christina Wasson
Licensing Information	This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/ .

Revision History	
Previous Version	None
Changes	None

Table of Contents

Discussion 4: Creation of Language Archive Typology	1
Discussion 5: Facilitating the Use of Language Archives	11
Discussion 6: Challenges and Other Factors to Consider in Development of UCD Guidelines	16
Possible Challenges in Disseminating Guidelines	17
Hardcore Users May Be Resistant to Change	17
Good Work Often Doesn't Count; Sanctions and Rewards	18
Software Limitations for Type 3	18
Can Relationships Be Built into Types 1-3 like for Type 4?	18
Manager of Language Archive Varies By Type	19
Discussion 7: Organizations to Partner with for UCD Guidelines	20

Explanation of Links Between Transcript Summaries and Video/Audio Files

The transcript summaries of the workshop have been linked to the relevant video files. Hyperlinks are provided in *blue text*, and time code for the video is noted periodically.

At some moments during the workshop, the videocamera failed to record. For those spots only (which are in transcript summaries 2 and 3), we have provided hyperlinks to and time code for the relevant audio files.

See the [Table of Contents: Transcripts and Recordings](#) for a full mapping of the relationships among transcript summaries, video, and audio files.

Discussion 4: Creation of Language Archive Typology

This portion of the workshop took place on February 21, 2016. In some places conversation is paraphrased on a turn-by-turn basis, in others there are direct quotations.

[Start Video 7](#)

[00:00]

Christina: provides an overview of what will be discussed for the second day of the workshop. This includes a follow-up from discussions on Saturday, a finalization of language archive types along with their roles and goals, and how user-centered design may be implemented in the various types. Christina also tells the group that she and Crysta compared notes from the first day about what the group was saying in terms of language archive types. She outlines the following possible types and asks the group whether or not they seem correct:

- Large, global language archives: ELAR and DoBeS
- Large language archives with more regional based collections
- Language archives that are part of larger digital repositories, usually with regional collections: Kaipuleohone

The group nods and there is a general consensus that these three archive types are correct.

Christina: she provides three additional types for discussion. Type 4 is an archive that resides on tribal lands, usually as part of an information center. Type 5 is a community-based, single-language archive. And Type 6 is an “elder archive.”

Daryl: asks what the difference is between Type 4 and Type 5.

Crysta and Christina say that is why they are bringing this up for discussion – to learn what the difference really is.

Daryl: “I see those as the same thing, really.”

Christina: agrees that Type 4 and Type 5 are the same thing, but asks the group if Type 6 is different.

The group believes Types 4 and 5 are the same thing and Ed says that Type 5 is just further along in development than Type 4.

Christina: asks the group what Type 6 is.

Daryl: “is that just living knowledge?”

Christina: asks for clarification about whether or not living knowledge constitutes an archive.

Daryl: “it’s just what’s collectively held among the population,” he says it may not even be written down.

The group agrees that although living knowledge may serve as a type of archive, it cannot benefit from user-centered design in its current form. However the group does agree that UCD can *learn* from this type of archive.

Therefore the group has reduced the types to 5, combining Type 4 and 5, and keeping in Type 6 (now Type 5).

[4:38]

Christina: asks Crysta to lead the discussion.

Crysta: explains that it would be helpful for the user-centered design process to see some of the similarities and differences in the roles and goals of each type. She is looking for lists for each type of archive that the UCD people can use. This will also help decide which two or three archives will be designed in the larger research trajectory.

Wesley: points out that Types 1-3 contain a sort of default of a broad audience/users sharing as much as possible except in certain circumstances, but that is not implied for Types 4 and 5. "It might be true, but it is not implied."

Shobhana: echoes the importance of the statement that although "it might be true it's not implied because there are groups around the world and each community will have a different spin on it. And I think for South Asia, people are very eager to share some types of information, a lot of types of information, but things they wouldn't want to share are ancestral lands and migration routes."

Christina asks for additional clarification and Wesley and Mandana make remarks that in Types 4 and 5 the archives are not by default meant to be open to everyone with a few restrictions. Instead, these types may only exist for a particular community and no one else.

Gary: believes there may be a hybrid in this. Larger archives may have a more regional mission. For instance, ANLA or Kaipuleohone may serve large audiences but they have also have a strong mission to support a more regional audience.

Mandana: the reason we are differentiating types is the "reach" of an archive. For instance, you may have one that is worldwide. Regional archives will be more focused on a particular area and may be not have such a broad reach to the outside. She provides ELAR as an example of a language archive with broad reach, citing their mission statement which can be found on their website. She says another goal they have is to "inform the public" of their cause. Type 4 may not actually address the broader issue of language endangerment because they are focused on just their language community.

Crysta: thinks looking at public mission statements like that may help differentiate among the types.

Gary: that helps me to think about it in terms of mission. It's not whether it's accessible to the public, it's whether that's in the mission. It doesn't mean people won't access the archive, it's just not part of their mission.

Andrea: "the third type is always going to be subservient to the larger collection it's a part of." Although there can be exceptions, the smaller archive will have to follow the policies of its parent.

Michael: a challenge for the third model is “how can communities get enough control over decisions they’re making to customize the access they’re looking for and the utilization, but still get the benefits from that larger parent repository source or that infrastructure, and deal with the policies and procedures they have in place.” Says he would like to see the “customizable capacity” at the level of the community so they are able to make decisions to have the tool work for their unique needs. Even in the Pacific Northwest it’s so diverse.

Susan: “we haven’t considered digital depositories that are requirements of journal articles.” These are monetarily driven repositories that are going to “start springing up faster and faster. Do we want to put them into the mix? Or take them off the table?”

Mandana: take them off the table. Sometimes the journal will create the repository for the data set.

Gary: says it is a interesting issue, because then one must consider the distinction between archives and repositories. He says maybe they’ll become the same thing in the future, but as of right now there isn’t really a user focus to them.

Susan: she says it’s definitely user-focused, like Dataverse of Harvard is super easy to use.

Mandana: but that’s restricted to an academic audience reading the article.

Shobhana: would some community members be interested as well?

Mandana: says they wouldn’t have access because you have to pay for it.

Susan: makes a comment that Dataverse is free.

Christina: asks if this is a new thing that journals are now requiring for contributors to publish their data set and where did it come from?

Susan: “to make any science more reproducible, you have to see the data set that was used to produce it in the first place.”

Christina clarifies to ask but why wasn’t this a requirement until now?

The group says the technology allows it now.

Mandana: “over the past 10 years there have been massive amounts of cases of fraud” especially in medical and cognitive psychology science. The entire landscape is reconfiguring to fix that.

Christina: knew about such fraud in medical studies but wasn’t aware of it in linguistics.

Mandana: clarifies that they don’t know if it has spread to linguistics, and rather the stipulation has been set in place to avoid it. They also haven’t had to give their data for checking.

Susan: some journals are starting of just giving the option. For instance, some allow you to just publish online in a way you see fit, but in others it’s mandatory to publish in that particular journals’ repository.

Christina: explains that in anthropology fieldnotes must be kept confidential, so this issue isn't going to hit the field of anthropology. For instance, IRB won't allow anthropologists to share their data in that way due to confidentiality. Even just removing names and such may not be enough because the local people can always read it and figure things out.

Shobhana: "it's in the works right now" to figure out what kinds of fieldnotes can be shared.

Gary: brings the conversation back to the archive situation, this particular dimension of repositories created by journals and the like are not within the scope of this meeting. "If we go back to the mission idea, the mission of something like dataverse is to provide access to data, but of course not something specific" of a particular language. It could also be something aside from language, could be other data sets.

Shobhana: asks if it's part of the Alaska Native Language Archive mission "to provide data sets for linguistic science to check and to keep a check on kinds of theories and descriptions that are out there."

Mandana: "I'm more than prepared to get ELAR ready to be a citable resource for journals. So I mean the moment we finish the migration and all these other things we will have handles so it will be stable so that it can be labeled and we are more than prepared to have subsets of things that can be cross-referenced for journal articles." She wants the archive to be a resource for the researcher, she also wants that deposit pages can hold publications and bibliographies, which wasn't the case until about 2000.

Gary: to answer Shobhana's question about ANLA, Gary says that although that is part of their mission, the core of their mission "is to Alaskan languages and Alaskan communities. So anything else we can do within that infrastructure that doesn't really add any cost is fine, but that could never be a core mission to just store datasets."

Susan: asks where the American Philosophical Society falls in the types?

The group says maybe Type 2 and Type 3?

Jennifer: she says the National Anthropological Archives fall under Type 3 because they're part of the Smithsonian.

[20:38]

Crysta: "are there any other ways to distinguish these from each other? What distinguishes Type 1 and Type 2 from each other besides just regional, is there any other thing?"

Susan: says funding is what distinguishes them. Type 1 repositories are mainly populated with data that come from the sister funding source, or funding source that the larger organization that repository belongs to, has. For example, with DoBeS it was Volkswagen grants.

Mandana: explains that funded depositors at ELAR are required to deposit in those collections in ELAR.

Felix: further explains that with Cologne that is not the case because the funding through Volkswagen is over.

Christina: “and what about Type 2, what’s the funding situation there?”

The group agrees that funding for Type 2 varies considerably, but that it may come from the state.

Crysta: asks how those that fall under Type 2, how do they get data in? She asks for clarification from Jennifer about people who have NSF grants, “can they go to Type 1 or Type 2?” and Jennifer confirms that, yes, they can.

Jennifer: Types 4 and 5 are coming to 1, 2, and 3 to deposit their data if they are applying for NSF grant funds.

Crysta: asks the group if there’s something to distinguish among Type 1, 2, and 3 in regards to the types of people who are allowed to deposit.

Mandana: “if they bring money” then there isn’t an issue.

Susan: for Type 2, each one of the archives has its own workflow as far as ingestion is concerned. At AILLA the mission is to take anything that is in or about an indigenous language of Latin America. They used to take it for free, but some are now requiring that there is a depositor because the burden is all on them. “Many days I show up and there are seven boxes waiting for me in the mail room, for me, all by myself.”

Michael: so there’s a dual need, analog sources (like Susan’s boxes) which have a time sensitive need to be digitize and stored. Then there’s the digital as well.

Susan: analog is actually least time-sensitive unless there’s a grant attached to digitize it to get it into the archive. Most of the time the analog stuff is legacy material from someone who is now deceased and any metadata is learned from the item itself, which isn’t a high priority. However a box with an external hard drive in it with a terabyte of data, because it was funded by NSF, that’s her priority.

[26:17]

Shobhana: what about a place like the University of North Texas that doesn’t have a mission dedicated to archiving languages but they have opened up their digital library to do that work. How do we provide a “Type” for communities that have no other place to go and they go to institutions or their “neighborhood university” with open doors?

Gary: so is it like a variety of Type 3?

Christina: maybe we can just make a note under Type 3 that it comes with a range of variation.

Susan: thinks that what Shobhana has described is the same as Type 3.

Crysta: “is there anything else that you can think of that in mission, in function, in who is served” that could differentiate the Types? Or are they serving kind of the same people?

Michael: “the user experience is one variable we could differentiate.”

Crysta: yes, let’s do that. Anything that can be found to differentiate between Type 1 and Type 2, maybe user experience, that would be great. Or Type 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mandana: a matrix would help. For instance, she could talk about ELAR. They serve the depositor by providing a repository where their items are safe and they can show it to their language communities. They serve other linguists that are interested in the languages of that family.

Susan: points out the material may not be accessible to all.

Mandana: because of restrictions? Yes. "We are 60% open. And from now on everything has to be open." She emphasizes they are trying to serve linguists in some way. She also hopes they can serve other academics in other fields. For instance, anthropologists or historians. "Our stuff is full of oral histories, it's full of food preparation things that might be of interest to other researchers that are looking at this kind of activity across. Or storytelling, or genocide, or testimonies, so other fields." She also talks about serving speakers and speaker communities.

Michael: "but again, you don't want to build games, right?"

Mandana: "but it's not about what we can do for them, but that we *have* repositories that they can use."

Gary: asks the group about the extent to which an archive allows for "value-added content" (such as creating games or educational materials) as part of their mission, may serve as a way to differentiate them further.

Mandana: it might help to think that ELAR's mission is purely restricted to documentation and stops right there and doesn't go into maintenance and revitalization. "All of the grants that ELAR gives, you cannot come up with a grant for creating teaching materials, it's not allowed in our grant scheme." You can dedicate money towards teaching materials, primers, etc but it's a very limited amount. That also restricts how the community is served.

Michael: says this is similar to the DEL grants, it's not focused on revitalization.

Crysta: "is that true of Type 2 as well?"

Andrea: "there are two issues on the table here, one is those four bullet points of who is sort of supposed to be served. And I would say that Types 1, 2, and 3 would all have all four of those...that we're trying to serve. There's a different issue here which is *how much* are we interested in revitalization purposes...and leaving out group 4 in this entire discussion."

Mandana: again asks for a matrix to cross-check with all Types about who it is they serve. She says this may help the UCD people gain a better understanding of the varied situations.

Crysta: agrees that would be helpful, because these considerations do affect design. For instance, for those archives that don't create educational materials, then the design will reflect that.

Christina: asks if there's a basic distinction between just documentation and educational materials and other works.

The group agrees there is a big difference.

Crysta: says Type 4 seems to include more value-added content and the educational and language revitalization aspect.

Daryl: Type 4 is more of a communal space than an archival space. "It might have an archive there, but in that space a lot of things can happen."

Santosh: so space comes first? And the archive might be part of that space?

Daryl: yes.

Michael: the archive is meaningless in that point because it's not the point.

Mandana: "we're not creating a social space for the community (Type 1) we just want them to know that there might be something relevant for you to take to your side of things." The limit of ELAR is engagement with community purposes.

Daryl: in his organization they deposit all copies of what they get from other archives to their own tribal archives. People don't look at that though, they look at photographs. Language archives they never touch, it's such a specialty. Unless you provide a way to make it useful to the average, community learner it won't be useful.

Mandana: points out that the process to transfer something from language archive material to educational material is a huge process and a lot of work.

Susan: when you start talking about value-added contents, they're in formats that are frequently going to change, so at AILLA they tend not to accept those sorts of things. "Like games, we don't accept anything that's an executable program because there's no way we can put that forward and make it play on a future machine."

Christina: is interested in exploring further the distinction between just documentation and revitalization/educational materials. "Where does FirstVoices fit into this?"

Alex: "I think we're in Type 4...just a broader reach."

Susan: it's like a conglomeration of Type 4s.

Crysta: "is [Type] 3 somewhat different than 1 and 2? Do you have *more* ability to create things like teaching materials and value-added [things]? Or is it just a depository where people come and-"

Jennifer: "that's a bigger challenge to do because that's not our larger mission. If we want to do that it's smaller projects where we have to get funding to do that, or it's a collaboration between the repository and whatever community the language is coming from. So it usually has to be an isolated project, there's not a large, overall initiative to do that unless there's an opportunity and a program initiative involved with that. Just because you're pulled in many different directions, this is just *one* collection we oversee. We also have a multitude of others." She provides an example of a sport collection, "we do education with that but it's *built* into programs that already exist at the university and also with the local tribal communities and high school programs." For some archives, it's their mission already to generate curriculum and education, "but we're just the host repository."

Andrea: to address the same question. “We can’t offer too much in the development of education materials because really the archive is just me and I have a full-time job and this is just part of it. Any depositor who has materials like that that can be successfully stored in the server and in the way things are organized in there could do that. But we are not intended to be a one-stop shop for everything. Our goal is long-term preservation of the data, discoverability through standardized metadata, and also changing the culture of linguistics through education about archiving.” However they [Kaipuleohone] are also interested in partnering with others who have the ability to do educational things and already have the audience in place. “We can store those materials and provide the stuff NSF is looking for, like the long-term preservation, but it makes more sense to partner with that other group and say, ‘you guys have the audience and educational ability.’”

[40:09]

Susan: “recently AILLA partnered with our overhead institution, which is the Latin America institution to develop online educational resources for the Indigenous language of Guatemala. This was with Department of Education funds.” They had speakers contributing materials, they also took archived materials that AILLA had and repurposed them for educational materials. They also worked with the educational language resource center to develop online modules. All that is developed will be archived at AILLA (as long as it’s not a game). “They took our materials, they created new materials, and those are going back into AILLA for preservation.”

Mandana: she would love to do that. “We have materials that could be used, we help them to use it to create something, and then they deposit that again and use it for whatever or however they want. That’s the thing we would love to do. But we are not the ones who do this.” ELAR wants folks to come to them.

Susan: reiterates that she is “not doing any of the revitalization” activities.

Ed: “on the storing of games, you might want to take them in anyway, even if you can’t use them, or even if they’re not usable immediately.” He says it reminds him of wax cylinders, eventually you may be able to re-format the technology to use the games. Something else that’s occurring right now is kids are building their own computers and use emulators that play any game that are stored in digital game repositories.

Susan: she says some of the newer digital repository programs will accept any format, regardless of whether it can be supported forward, but preserving it anyway is possible. “Just in case we need that at some point in the future.”

Gary: says one can also store source files, which is made easy if they’re already on Git Hub.

Susan: her point is that in the original AILLA software they couldn’t accept anything that wasn’t in a specific format, and none of the games had that extension. Newer digital repositories do allow it, but it hasn’t been a policy in the past.

Mandana: explains how ELAR partners with others to create educational materials. They also partner with researchers. “We want to support data mining on the materials for cross-linguistic research. So if someone comes in and asks, ‘can we use these materials?’ then we can allow them to use this.” Basically there’s a data set and ELAR is partnering with someone else who wants to do something with it.

Wesley: “we’re talking about archives in terms of their existing policies and making the users fit to that. Thinking about my own job, where I have certain missions and things that fall under the contract in Native American Studies. If somebody calls and wants information about this powwow and I respond ‘well that’s not really my job’ then that will throw off a relationship.” He says he might do that anyway, but particularly for Type 3, the idea is “that’s not our mission” when someone asks for something that’s outside the parameters of the mission, instead of thinking what does the user actually want. He asks if we’re looking at it in this way – this is the policy, this is the way things are instead of what the user actually wants.

Mandana: in her understanding they’re just telling Crysta all of the things that they do so she understands each archive, what they’re doing now, and where they would like to go.

Gary: “if we start talking about partnering and different projects, we could probably talk about every archive doing that to some extent.” He still thinks there’s a difference between saying “I can do that” and “this is my mission.”

Santosh: “that’s the reconceptualization that Christina was talking about yesterday. First we understand the lay of the land.” Then we look at users and who is not being served. Who is missing out? Map the terrain and then we ask what is the rule of the land? Then we respond to that.

Loriene: “are people responding respective of their own institutions, or own settings, or own limitations, with some fear of being asked to develop things and go beyond unless there’s money. So what you want to do is to be able to take yourself out of your own personal setting and say, ‘what is possible?’”

[47:10]

Christina: “it really seems like this documentation-only mission, which is very common apparently, is not user-centered, it’s just not. Do we want to think about that in terms of the future?” Like maybe that’s just how it is, or “maybe some of these archives want to think about broadening their mission to say, yes, the finances are for documentation but we do want to be more concerned about more user-centered,” and think about partnering with others for funding sources to make games or educational materials. Some of this is already going on, but it could be more extended if archives decide they want to focus more on users.

Gary: points out the time-scale. There were archives in the past who didn’t focus on the user but they are very useful to users today. They weren’t thinking about the users at the time. We have to be careful about focusing on users today because in the future they may be happy the documentation was there.

Mandana: “we’re doing this for posterity but I still believe there’s a lot of things in the repository now that could be of interest to a lot of people...we would love to open our reach for potentially different users and people, but we’re limited in that. This is exactly the part where we need help to understand better how we can improve our interfaces, our structure, our metadata” to feed back to documents for linguists so they can learn and add richer metadata. She looks at it as a cycle to enhance the materials.

Christina: clarifies that she didn’t say those types of archives aren’t useful, rather they are not user-centered. Because UCD is a conscious, intentional, and strategic process to contact users who are alive today and see whether there might be ways, better ways, to connect to users more than we are?

Ed: “the academics are building these archives...and so you build it for people like yourself. So the door is an academic door, right? So other academics walk along and say, ‘oh! I know how to open this door. And it’s for me! And everything in there is for me!’ And for other people who are not academics, they look at these archives and they’re like looking at tools from some foreign thing, like a hammer with no nails or like a saw but there’s nothing to cut. The door isn’t *made* for them. And so if you go to your search windows and some of the pages we’ve seen in the last day or two, it’s just crazy text. I mean, I have a Master’s degree and stuff, but I’m like this is kind of crazy, for somebody even of *my* background. And so you’re talking, is this only for PhD researcher door? Are you only able to use the things inside for getting your PhD? Because that’s how it’s being framed, right? It’s like Alice in Wonderland and you have this very small door, and Alice is trying to open it. It doesn’t fit. One of the things I really liked about the FirstVoices thing, is that the interface is obviously meant for any user, right? It’s not just for like an academic user, although I’m sure there are places you can go in there that are going to be more academically focused.”

Mandana: “I think it’s a brilliant metaphor.” Even in the academic world, a linguist may not be sure if they can fit through the door, and folks from other fields may just think the door isn’t meant for them and not even try.

Daryl: “I would take this one step farther. Not only are the institutions academic, but even the archives that you think people want, are written by academics and can be read only by academics.” Says that even if an average community member can get to the archive, then what are they going to do with it? “There needs to be a process that makes it usable to them.”

Shobhana: “even as an academic I feel like I’m shut out a lot.” Data is put in an archive by researchers who are not concerned about the usability of their data for other people. She says there are several reasons why that is. First, intellectual property, someone may not be ready to share their information which is a cultural thing in linguistics. Some of that is privacy, how much more can we do with sharing? If the data is put in there in a way that can be mined then there’s more projects that can be done.

Mandana: says there also needs to be a reason for academics to put their data in, like rewards.

Christina: “one of the things that intrigues me about this discussion, is that, as Wesley said yesterday that there’s always this sort of default assumption that linguists are the primary target audience for archives, and so it seems like we often discuss that user group differently from, say, communities as user groups. In that we often don’t even talk about linguists that they’re so *default* that most of the conversation, I think, has been more on language communities. And I would suggest that we try to level how we look at different user groups and talk about the needs of linguists more explicitly, but kind of put them more, I mean they are a legitimate user group I think, but so are other user groups. And because one of the funny things is we keep having this default assumption...but then it seems they don’t even work well for linguists!”

Mandana: “exactly!”

Gary: “that’s why we don’t talk about, not because it’s default, but because they’re not using them, they’re not the users.”

Susan: that’s why she left the linguists group and went to the archivists group [laughs].

Ed: “even the language materials that you can get into access, I’m sure – you’ve seen this [pointing to Daryl] – you need like a key to be able to understand what you’re looking at. Not only is it in another language but there’s another language of linguistics on top of it.” In addition, he notes an academic grammar. Therefore it’s a system of multiple lenses, and “if you don’t have each of those lenses you’re not going to be able to read what you’re looking at.”

Susan: she says it’s still more complicated than that. Even as linguists she may not be able to look through the linguistic lens from over 200 years ago.

Ed: points out a magnifying glass that can go over something. “Even if you just had a tool like that to go across the face of documents in an archive,” it may allow for better interpretation of the linguistic lens.

Susan: says that what Ed is describing is something humanists are creating. “They start with some sort of archival document, and the places I’ve seen it done is with maps, and as you take your mouse across the image of the map, things appear that you can click on” These things could be information windows, a PDF of an historical document, etc. She says that may take a digital scholarship team to create. However they’re fabulous and Susan says, “I would love to be able to create those and stick it in AILLA.” She then makes a quick comment “graduate students” to indicate they may be brought in to do such work.

Mandana: she says we made a big step here, “because it’s not about distinguishing between the linguists and the communities, but that the door that we have, the way it was created, doesn’t fit even the linguists.”

Christina: “because it’s not user-centered for any user group.”

Group argues that some archives aren’t even user-centered for *any* stakeholder group.

Discussion 5: Facilitating the Use of Language Archives

Susan: “any large archive that has any large collection has a *guide* to that collection. So some curator writes a guide to the collection. And that’s kind of what Ed was describing, a guide to the collection. And we don’t have those in our language archives. If you go to any other historical archive, physical archive, they have guides to their collections that you can consult to help you find what you need in the collection.”

[59:39]

Jennifer: “we have finding aids for all of our collections. So a list, what’s in each collection? What’s in each box? If it’s a digital collection we’re trying to do the same thing, but you will have a guide and it will walk you through the collection.” It will even discuss who has rights, copyright, how to use the collection, access restrictions, and a list of inventory.

Christina: so language archives don’t have that?

Various group members say “no.”

Susan: digital language archives were started by linguists and they didn’t know about collection guides.

Mandana: “endangered language archives are all run by linguists turned archivists, so we’re trying to do our best in a way.”

Susan: says she has a few guides on AILLA. If people have questions she will write out notes and stick it on the guide. But they’re 100% dependent on depositors writing the guides for their material. She says anthropologists are particularly good at that. However others may write nothing.

Jennifer: particularly for Type 3, larger repositories, that’s standard operating procedure that they will recreate guides for collections. They don’t have it for every collection due to backlog, but that is the goal, for every collection to have a guide or finding aid that’s available online. Whether it’s through your own website or through a regional database. “They’re not just findable for someone coming to your repository, but regionally anybody could find those in that database.”

Susan: “that’s how researchers find collections that aren’t online.”

Jennifer: guides can be put in larger, federal databases so it’s findable. They try to work with depositors to have them do that so they can attend to their backlog and have some sort of guide prior to acquiring the collection.

Gary: “I’m still thinking that a finding aid and a collection guide...were a little bit behind, we’re headed that way, that’s a goal...but it still seems to me like that’s still different than addressing Ed’s issue of interpretation.” That’s a different level of interpretation.

Mandana: and not everyone needs to know of everything. She explains that understanding the grammatical structure of particular sentences may not be the most useful thing, but rather understanding what a collection is about.

Shobhana: “but we do want people who deposit things to be responsible depositors...we don’t want just raw data we can’t do anything with.”

Mandana: at ELAR, they’re trying to require depositors, for every item, a *human readable description* which means “please say this is a recording of someone talking about X.” Something that anyone can go in and see what it’s about. Because this didn’t exist in the metadata. Previously linguists would write ergative things that no one could understand but them. The point is linguists are not trained to do these things.

[1:04:52]

Christina: to summarize thus far, speaker communities would like to have their materials accessible without esoteric academic knowledge and FirstVoices is an example of having good materials. “So what would linguists like to make data useful to linguists? Rich metadata?”

Mandana: in principal it’s the same.

Daryl: just do different things with it.

Mandana: “they would like to have the same, and there’s a couple of different sets of information that they would want. I think Gary mentioned it. Just to know the amount of data that is translated and transcribed. Very simple.”

Christina: “maybe there’s very different types of linguistics stuff. Because what you were talking about seemed more historical and you had the fieldnotes and like that, but I’ve also heard about more computational, I think it’s computational, where you want to have comparisons across a lot of languages, so there needs to be more metadata, right?”

Shobhana: “an annotated corpora is what-a corpus, a connected text that has been analyzed to some extent. It could just be bare bones analysis or it could be very deep analysis, but annotated corpora are what a linguist would really need.” It acts as a tool to do language comparisons or to extract linguistic information.

Susan: “what exactly do you mean by annotated?”

Shobhana: “the basic thing would be the annotation with some sort of translation. Even if it’s just a paragraph saying what the whole thing is about, but you can go deeper where every single word is glossed or the word is broken up into its component parts and glossed.” That would provide the analyst, whoever they are, “a handle on the language.” She says there’s no point for funders to provide money over a few years if the deposit then requires someone else to come in and annotate it.

Mandana: “but that’s how it is.”

Gary: “we don’t have a sense of – I think this is the issue – we don’t have a sense of how rich the existing annotated corpora are.”

Mandana: “the problem is these are not corpora, they’re eclectic collections of stuff.”

Christina: asks the group to define *corpora* and the singular of it.

Group says *corpus* is the singular.

Shobhana: “I have a corpus based on my documentation project. It’s a collection of traditional narratives, conversations, monologues, other types of printed materials. All of which have been typed into a database. And then analyzed sentence by sentence, word by word, and I have digital and audio files to back up that material. So it takes years to put that together, but even five selections from that corpus would be a lot of information for a linguist to have.”

Susan: says there are different definitions of *corpora*. For instance, “a computational linguist that wants to do some sort of audio to transcription, what *they* need for a corpora is thousands of examples of the same utterances. So her corpora [motioning to Shobhana] and my corpora by our definitions could not be used by as the same for a computational linguist because we have different utterances. We don’t have the exact same material in the recordings, in the transcriptions, and the annotations.” It’s a word thrown around in linguistics but everyone has a different definition of what *corpora* means.

Shobhana: in a basic way, a corpus is a rich annotation of some sort.

Susan: she agrees, but the specifics can be different.

Justin: “linguists are not going to gravitate towards that kind of material if they can’t find things.” For instance, a linguist isn’t going to sit down and search for every word that begins with the letter “P” if it’s not easily findable.

Mandana: “it’s not just about preparing all this material but *finding* that information, right? So the linguist-user needs to be able to find that information” and know what level it’s on. That way they can determine if the information is ready to be used now or requires years of annotation to be usable.

Justin: even very good finding aids will tell you the topic but not the linguistic details a linguist would want to know.

Christina: “so is it like more searchability?”

Gary: “for a corpus, it’s essentially recordings with transcriptions.”

Christina: clarifies she meant making it more accessible to linguists.

Gary: the transcriptions are what make it more accessible, because those can be searched, whereas the audio” isn’t as helpful.

[1:11:00]

Crysta: wants to summarize using Ed’s door analogy. “I think, that even though this sounds really simple...we can kind of sum this up as, we need to design so that – we need to help depositors *open* the door.” She clarifies she doesn’t want to design something to force them to open the door, but it can be designed. Then there needs to be another design to help *all* of the users, whether it’s a linguist or an anthropologist or someone from the community or some other researcher. To enter the door, a specific design is required, but Crysta believes there’s another component which is once they’re *through* the door, “trying to design it for facilitating partnership.”

Michael: “or what tools are available to you once you’re through there?”

Crysta: agrees, there just needs to be some way to escort and guide users. For instance, like Ed’s Siri example for once someone is through the door. She admits this may sound simple after all of the discussion, but “that’s the overarching goal and it sounds like starting from scratch.” The UCD team knows who we to get to [compiled info from slides and those present at the workshop] to understand needs. She says she doesn’t think it’s necessary to articulate each user group’s needs because there isn’t enough time at the workshop for it. “At least we know who we need to go to, to talk about how to enter the door, how they would like to enter the door, what would make the door appealing and the right size for people.”

Ed: “sometimes there’s not even the door there for how the user wants to use the material.” For example, at the ANLA, you can find great information, but there’ll be a recording that says “this person talks in this language” then you listen to it and you interpret it, but “the people who can annotate it, the people who can make it accessible to linguists and to other communities, I can’t add the data on there that says what it’s about, right? So I’m not even able to make the door so that people can open it up. I know exactly what he’s talking about, but I can’t help anybody else understand what’s on there.”

Crysta: is there a way to let other people annotate data, is that allowed?

Susan: says that in AILLA people *can* annotate the data. She explains that if Ed were to listen to a recording and knows more about it that he can share, she would ask him to create a document and send it to her. Once she has the document she can upload it to AILLA and link it to the recording.

Gary: but a person can't go in there and do that themselves?

Susan: right now she vets it but in the near future she wants people to be able to do it all themselves.

Ed: believes it's important to "let the community wrestle about it" by putting a piece up and allowing people to discuss and decide what the material is saying, so a sort of communal interpretation.

Susan: "so are you thinking like social media site where somebody puts a comment and somebody replies? You know like a comments feature?"

Ed: agrees that something like that is what he means but is unsure how that would be accomplished.

Santosh: says this might be similar to Wikipedia where someone submits something and a group of people can work on it and it becomes public knowledge.

Christina: "or like a blog post even where people comment on it."

Loriene: if you're familiar with Mukurtu, communities add their own records with their own explanations. Sometimes these are available only to the community itself.

Mandana: "you want to be careful because that can result in a war, right? One person says 'it's this' and the other person says 'no, it's not' and then-"

Group members say but that's for the community to decide, they should be able to figure that out.

Daryl: "I think I can say with confidence that source documents for language are not learning tools for language learners. So, it has to go through some sort of transformation before it can become user [friendly]." Even the deliverer needs to be trained. These were written by academics, for academics. So now people like Daryl are "filling that gap" for what was recorded about history, language, and culture and seeing how it can be consumed by young learners and old learners. "That's a huge process in there. There's no easy way to do that."

Christina: speaking to Daryl, "do you partner with other groups that prepare educational materials or games?"

Daryl: partner? Language revitalization is a small world and we share ideas and approaches. The bulk of the work is just processing the source documents. There's a tremendous amount of information and it takes a lot of real work and it filters down through these lenses of trained educators, such as linguists and anthropologists, to put it into a form people can make something useful of it.

Justin: in this discussion about requiring depositors to provide some level of metadata, he thinks it would be better to have rich metadata, but he knows of many languages that have recordings and he would hate to think the recordings would be turned away if they don't have appropriate metadata. Some years down the road someone may find the recording very valuable.

Mandana: if we learn better now we can train those who are doing it to do it better. She doesn't think the group is saying that if there is no metadata then the recordings are invaluable, she knows they need to preserve it, but it needs to be done better because linguists are not trained in creating rich metadata.

Ed: "there needs to be a delineation of the information that comes in. Maybe like one star is raw information that you don't have much information on, and then five stars is something that's been completely annotated and completely worked through. So that way you know where this information is in the spectrum of academic development and accessibility. So five stars is accessible to everybody, three stars will just be accessible to linguists."

The group agrees this might be a good idea.

Susan: that would be really subjective though.

Ed: but it will be organized to siphon to different groups.

Christina: "it could even be a crowdsource thing."

Discussion 6: Challenges and Other Factors to Consider in Development of UCD Guidelines

[1:21:45]

Christina: to move on to other topics, Christina presents the basic UCD guidelines she discussed near the beginning of the workshop, but she frames them with the recent discussions in mind:

- Identify your main user groups and then expand on that because it depends on how much each archive knows about its users.
- Conduct research with these main user groups in terms of information access and use.
- Design or redesign the archive and describe what that would look like. For instance, collaborative, interdisciplinary, and iterative.
- What next? Develop a maintenance plan and updating plan because that usually isn't done and you have to keep iterating these for their entire existence.
- Address funding and resource challenges. She has been hearing about this a lot, maybe partnerships or bringing in students is the answer.

"If we came up with a set of guidelines it probably wouldn't look like that, but sort of like that. What kinds of – so here's the questions I want to ask: what kinds of challenges are we going to run into in developing such guidelines, who will be the biggest fans of such guidelines? Advice on further learning, further things we need to explore before we even understand the relevant issues? And once we do feel ready, we would like to work with two or three archives, either existing archives or newly developing archives to really develop – I don't think we can develop good guidelines without testing them out and iterating them on a couple of actual archives. So,

do you have suggestions for those? Those are kind of all the questions. So I guess starting with what challenges are we likely to run into?”

Daryl: “I think we have to define who the user is, in great detail. Who is the user? Because you can’t design anything without knowing what your user’s skills are, what their interests are, what their capabilities are. Who is the user? I can’t go anywhere until that’s – until I have some sense of what that is. Because that’s where I’m conflicting here. I get a sense that the users are all over the board here, I can’t hone it down to something.”

Christina: asks Daryl to specify whether he means the user of the language archive or the user of the user-centered design guidelines.

Mandana: “for me, guidelines is great. I want you to help me redesign my archive so that I can open the doors and I learn how to open the doors and so I can help the linguists that are feeding this archive with giving enough material and information and learning and teaching about this so I can inform my university what to train our students in.” She wants the UCD team to tell her how to do this. For instance, how specific should she go? She wants to know “how do I do this?”

Possible Challenges in Disseminating Guidelines

Christina: “well that’s perfect because that’s exactly what we want to do. Do you think there are things we should be aware of, like problems we’re going to encounter if we do this? People who hate or love what we’re doing?”

Hardcore Users May Be Resistant to Change

Susan: everyone is resistant to change, the hardcore users are those who would be most resistant. For instance, any time AILLA changes their interface the hardcore users have a new learning curve they have to overcome.

Crysta: “well the depositors are kind of hardcore users, right?”

Susan: she disagrees because she does all the work for her depositors. There is the exception of one depositor who does their own work.

Mandana: points out that since ELAR gives money, they can force depositors to do the metadata in a particular format.

Susan: points out there are people who use AILLA regularly in a variety of capacities, for instance, to teach classes or research. “Those are the people who I think will be the most resistant to change.”

Santosh: if anything we should then be making their tasks easier and not more difficult.

Mandana: she mentions there is a class that uses ELAR sometimes for an assignment.

Good Work Often Doesn't Count; Sanctions and Rewards

Wesley: "in terms of challenges, the idea that more guidelines or more best practices will take more time, time that people think they don't have or honestly don't have, and there's a related idea of good work not really counting in academia at a higher level." For instance, "I have an article up, that counts." Therefore, "doing it right, the burden falls on the person doing it. When I think of these guidelines, they really need to have some teeth and be backed by major committees."

Santosh: is there a "best depositor award?"

Susan: yes, they just started it.

Mandana: she says they have just started this, but now DELAMAN has the Boas award for early career researchers. This summer is the first round where folks can submit for the best collection which will then be evaluated. So an exemplar collection will be recognized from a linguistic point of view. That will help ELAR improve and provide others with an example to go with.

Santosh: like employee of the month!

Susan: or a frequent user award.

[End Video 7 \[1:30:43\]](#)

Software Limitations for Type 3

[Start Video 8](#)

[00:29]

Justin: one of the things that came up several times was language archives are embedded within a larger institutional structure...we can come up with all of the ideas that we want, but then if it's within some sort of software limitations that the language archive portion doesn't have any control over then there are going to be some issues with that. There will have to be more advocacy in that.

Mandana: and the guidelines can actually help if Andrea's archive wants to grow. There should be guidelines to help if that situation comes to pass. "we have to do it backwards, but if there's a small one that's growing, they can move forward."

Can Relationships Be Built into Types 1-3 like for Type 4?

Justin: "you have the language archives that are being successful for communities are the Type 4 archives and we've been talking a lot, I think, today it sounds like most of the points that were raised were around Types 1 through 3. And I think there's the really, fundamental question of how, given the diversity of all the communities that are being served by the large, global and even the regional archives, how can you build in those very specific, very local networks of human relationships that are involved in the information gathering and information, the process of having and creating knowledge. How can you reproduce that in a general kind of way? And

maybe FirstVoices is a good example of where you've managed to do that." That's the big question right now, "is this even fundamentally possible?"

Christina: "and is it maybe totally different between type 4 and Types 1 through 3?"

The group agrees it is.

Justin: "and how do Types 1 through 3 learn from Type 4?" Although the institutional limitations may be "too big" he asks "how do you build that into the design?"

Ed: "I wouldn't say there's like this big gap between Types 1-3 and 4. You're going to have the same types of users in Types 1-3 as you're going to have in 4. You're going to have people who are hardcore researchers coming out to access this information also, I've see it even in our little place, where people come out and research place-based information to see if the things we have are different than what people have elsewhere. And I also think that Types 1-3, I guess for us, our relationship with, I think it was a Type 2, at ANLA, is a very big thing for us. And so, it's not like, if they thought 'you're too different from us' then maybe they wouldn't have established the partnership. Or maybe they would have said, 'well, you're doing a different thing than we do. How can we work with you? What do we need to do here? And kind of, working that out. Being open to working those kinds of things out and sharing the collection with us and stuff like that. And sharing ideas about how we catalogue and sharing ideas about how we can share things that are coming in new to us with them. So I think those kinds of, it's not that...I just don't want it to be put as something that's different in a sense that it's unapproachable, right? It's approachable! Right? And it should be approached. When you're trying to actually reach the user. Because I've been in the ANLA multiple times, it's the one I'm obviously most familiar with, but I've never seen tons of kids in there like I have in Dinjii Zhuh K'yaa. I mean I've never seen like elders kind of stop by and hang out at the ANLA, right...? You can't be so different as to think that the [Type] 1 through 3s can't bridge that gap or something."

Crysta: "I think one of our goals would be to help design specifically *for* partnerships. That's kind of what I was hearing in there, is to try and design it so that's facilitated actually."

Manager of Language Archive Varies By Type

Wesley: "one of the differences that I do see existing, is that [Types] 3 and 4 are likely to hire a sort of a main staff member who does those sorts of things to the degree that may not be true for [Types] 1 and 2. Language specific archives will hire a linguist to run the archive. Something like Type 4 is likely to hire somebody who does all of those things where that type of outreach is already part of their training or assumed to be..."

Christina: asks for clarification, "so Type 4 hires a more general person, is that what you're saying?"

Wesley: "if they have money, yes. Somebody who already does that type of networking or somebody whose job entails doing all of these different things whereas a language archive that's run by a linguist, particularly somebody who already has others in roles-"

Loriene: "the staffing for that would be generally someone with academic preparation."

[07:30]

Mandana: “well we just had a digital archivist, she is a linguist, but her strongest asset is that she’s a very approachable person who helps people to find things and loves to talk to people to connect collections, but to also bring them in...she can really talk well and she’s a very good teacher and she has the most incredible patience. And we’ve made the point to have someone like this who cannot scare people off from depositing or from looking for things or something.”

Andrea: agrees that the current archivists in Types 1 and 2 (and also Kaipuleohone) are “linguists with lots of experience in cross-cultural communication and working with communities and being outside of their academic environment for the most part.”

Mandana: she says all of them have been through the pain of not knowing how to prepare a collection and having difficulties finding things.

Susan: “the pain of learning how to put your deposit together, put it in an archive, not a single person in here with maybe the exception of Lorienne and Jennifer have in a training in curation. And so, as linguists, as anthropologists, we’re not trained to be curators. We’re kind of trained to be curators of ideas, so it’s kind of like just one step further. We know how to take ideas and glean ideas from different sources and build something out of them, but we’re not taught how to apply that to do our data and curate. So I think a lot of the issues that the depositors have are because they don’t know how to curate a collection and there’s a huge learning curve. Once you go through it you can realize, ‘oh, I should have done it this way, oh, next time I’ll do it that way.’”

[End Video 8 \[10:22\]](#)

Discussion 7: Organizations to Partner with for UCD Guidelines

[Start Video 9](#)

[00:45]

Christina: “the only item we didn’t get to in the proceeding discussion was just where we asked for volunteers of archives that might want to continue to work with us in the future as we work to develop the user-centered design guidelines.”

Susan (AILLA), Felix (Cologne), and Andrea (Kaipuleohone) raise their hands.

Susan: says that AILLA is “perfectly poised” to be part of the ongoing research efforts because they are in the process of migration.

The group notes that Mandana (ELAR) is not present at the time but she would also offer ELAR.

Santosh: Mandana told him during the break that she is ready to get started and put intercepts on the site to redo the UI.

Christina: “in fact we may have more volunteers than we can handle!”

The group notes that there is a volunteer from each Type except for Type 4 at the moment. Mandana (ELAR) represents Type 1, Susan (AILLA) represents Type 2, and Andrea (Kaipuleohone) represents Type 3.

Susan suggests Ed (Dinjii Zhuh K'yaa) but the group notes that Daryl (Myaamia Center) has more resources.

Daryl: "I will say that the Miami Tribe has a Myaamia Heritage Archive Museum, which is a state-of-the-art archive. It has fingerprint entry, climate control. I would say that there's probably still some need, there's only two staff. I mean, it's possible, I would have to approach them about that. The Center could help facilitate things because it's kind of our specialty to help them with the research related stuff. It would be a possibility."

Christina: "would you be open to that?"

Daryl: nods his head yes. Thinks the best thing to do would be to have a conference call among himself, Wesley, Christina, and Megan Dory (archivist for the Myaamia Heritage Archive Museum) to discuss everything.

The group also notes Alex could participate.

Christina: comments on the large amount of volunteers.

Santosh: and also "we were talking about what is the scope of what we (UCD team) can do."

Christina: "what Gary and I had always talked about was applying for another DEL grant, but I'm open to applying for any kind of grant or using class projects, whatever we can, any way we can move this forward, I'm open to."

Gary: "what would it take in terms of resources?"

Christina: believes that is "a more fine-grained conversation" that should be had later on. In terms of cost it will be travel, people's labor and time.

[04:40]

Christina: "another thing we wanted to get your wisdom on was, that eventually it seems like we should be working with some of the existing organizations that care about these issues. So this is looking to the future. In a couple of years when we have, what we think, are a solid set of user-centered design guidelines for language archives, who should we work with to disseminate them? We should think about this now to collaborate." She lists organizations they have already come up with:

- Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) program at NSF
- Community on Endangered Languages and their Preservation (CELP)
- DELAMAN
- ATALM

She asks the group for other suggestions and they come up with the following:

- UNESCO
- International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC)
- Indigenous Language Institute (ILI)

Christina: questions whether or not the UCD team could work with all of these organizations, but it's a good exercise to "map the universe" of these organizations.

Mandana: "there's a UK-NSF partnership, so there's a grant that we can apply together for. Usually there's a restriction on nationality...but there's one that we can both apply in partnership."

Shobhana: "it's not a specific grant, but it's any existing NSF opportunity where you can apply to UK and then the NSF partner to apply to NSF and split the cost."

Mandana: "which is a nice opportunity, because usually we are excluded from NSF collaboration." She says she can collaborate as a consultant, but there are restrictions. She says another possibility is networking grants that allow for meetings.

Shobhana: "there is something called SAVI, which is Science Across Virtual Institutes, that could be a ride-along with the NSF proposal. It gives you about \$50,000." She asks Mandana what happened to "Digging into Data."

Mandana: it was just announced.

Shobhana: asks whether or not they (Digging into Data) has talked about "creating the shovel" and "actually doing the shoveling." So at this point it would be the creation of the shovel, getting the tool ready.

Mandana and Shobhana provide additional information about Digging into Data. It was initiated by NEH but is a conglomeration of different trans-Atlantic partners. South American has also been added.

Mandana: reading from the website, "computational intensive research in the humanities and social sciences." She says there might be something to look at there.

Christina: "I think it's definitely interesting to explore grant opportunities as well, but in terms of partnering with organizations, for instance, DEL, what would that look like? Would we maybe eventually propose to DEL that they add guidelines to their guidelines?"

Susan: says DEL looks to DELAMAN for those kinds of things.

Christina: "so it would make more sense to work with DELAMAN?"

Others say it's LSA, the Linguistic Society of America.

Mandana: says there are other organizations to look at, for instance, Mellon might be interested. "These are guidelines that should be available," and should be something to look towards for these organizations so that when they create something they have direction.

Christina: agrees, it would be like a resource available on a website.

Mandana: believes there are other European organizations that can adopt the guidelines as well.

Christina: “so we would somehow need to connect with the organizations, which I know a lot of you guys are already connected with, to go through some kind of adoption process. Or what does that look like? DELAMAN for instance.”

Andrea: “DELAMAN would probably post recommendations on its website and other bodies refer to DELAMAN for guidelines.”

Christina: “and we would just talk to people at DELAMAN and say, ‘hey, we have something here.’”

Andrea: yes, basically.

Mandana: “you might want to consider that this is really important, not only for endangered languages people, but for any kind of archive. So you need to talk to libraries and archive associations, because those are the ones who create archives.” It’s also about the ones who want to create one, what to keep in mind. She says this is important for universities and libraries as well.

[11:59]

Christina: “so that would be like ATALM?”

Jennifer: no, because ATALM is specifically for indigenous communities but at the higher level, generally is the Society for American Archivists, and there’s also the Association of Recorded Sound that give guidance for language recordings.

Mandana: it’s about finding out who creates archives. That will include libraries, universities, cities.

Loriene: American Libraries Association, she was president.

Christina: “for dissemination purposes the more the better! So long as it’s not too many hours per, I mean we all have limited time, but it sounds like it’s not going to require too much of a time investment.”

Shobhana: suggests putting together a panel for LSA where people can present the process of the change. Call for presentations are in May.

Christina: she agrees that presenting at conferences and community groups is important, but that’s a whole other piece.

Gary: “that could be something that could be used to push a resolution at LSA. So it’s more than just presenting a paper at LSA.”

Mandana: if you have an endorsement from LSA you will have strong footing.

Christina: “it sounds like a panel is something different from those at anthropology conferences.”

Many group members agree that there is a difference.

Gary: there will only be a handful of them at the meeting which are somehow endorsed by the executive committee.

Andrea: "it's kind of a special event."

Christina: thinks this is great information and something to keep in mind when we get to dissemination. "The next thing I wanted to raise was, in fact, dissemination strategies. And I think presenting at conferences is one obvious one. Are there other dissemination strategies we should think about?" Although this is something for further in the future, she wants to take advantage of everyone in the same room.

Shobhana: Mandana has the training school?

Mandana: "if I think about guidelines I'm not so sure I understand which guidelines you're thinking about. Creating user-centered archives? If it's that then you need to talk to archivists and to librarians...so they get it right from the beginning." If it's about what they learned from the process of creating user-friendly interfaces, then she thinks they can create guidelines out of that to create richer metadata and she train her people in doing that. For instance, recording more vernacular, day-to-day things, which in turn feeds back into collections. "It makes it more accessible because it has a human readable description, for example. So on that level we can engage strongly."

Susan: "the summer school COLANG would be a good place to present this-

Mandana: but it depends what?

Susan: "the guidelines, because we have a community of language archives class at COLANG, and there are a half a dozen other classes at COLANG that address issues related to archives. So it would be very easy to add one more class on issues that relate to archives." She says this also relates to the larger picture of digital scholarship, which many of the students are going to do more and more of. If they learn about UCD in the context of archives, the students can apply that to other digital scholarship projects.

Gary and Susan discuss COLANG, Gary is unsure where the next one is, maybe Florida?

Susan: asks Christina about her timeline.

Christina: a few years, like two or three.

Susan: "so we would be talking about Florida then, or wherever it's going to be."

Shobhana: "how about the LSA Institute in Kentucky?"

Susan: "I was just saying that might be too soon because those proposals come out this Spring or this Fall."

Christina: agrees because this project is long-term. Asks the group if they can think of any other kinds of dissemination activities, specifically for Type 4.

Michael: the dissemination of Type 4 is very different, a lot more personal. Therefore strategies would include visiting individual community groups. "There's a lot more person-to-person touch needed there."

Christina: “and I’ve always thought that that would be part of it and that eventually money needs to be built into a grant to visit places like that, but even knowing, having them invite us and knowing we exist kind of thing?”

Loriene: tribal colleges have their own invitation-only event every year in mid-June. “They work in settings where it’s not just a library, it’s the tribal records office, language centers, etc.”

[19:30]

Gary: asks Michael to speak about Mukurtu. Since Mukurtu was designed for access it would be great to have a Mukurtu archive participating in the user-centered design process.

Jennifer: “we’re using it at University of Oregon for the Neeley (sp?) project.”

Gary: “I don’t know where that fits into the picture, but it seems like that would be good.”

Jennifer: says they’re developing this particular archive, using Mukurtu, with a larger grant that contains hubs and spokes.

Christina: tells the group that if they are unaware of Mukurtu they should take a look at it. “It’s an approach that was developed by Kim Christen Withey, who is not technically an anthropologist, but has an interdisciplinary degree and she’s very anthropological, and originally worked with an Indigenous community in Australia and developed a very different user interface, like more intuitive, not a lot of metadata.”

Mandana: “it’s not text heavy.”

Christina: agrees. “And it’s now being sort of disseminated, or adopted, by a number of language archives.”

Jennifer: says it was created specifically for Indigenous communities “to control access and protocols because there wasn’t any system out there that could serve the needs of these communities. So that was the specific reason it was created.”

Daryl: asks if there is a website to learn more about Mukurtu.

The group says to use www.mukurtu.org and Jennifer says she is on the advisory committee for the development of the software and she can put folks in touch with Kim.

Gary: “would it make sense to possibly include some user-centered design work within the context of the hubs and spokes work?”

Jennifer: “yes, they have to contact Kim for that to see if it can be built into the grant. I’m sure it could be.”

Christina: “and Kim was actually going to be part of this workshop and then she in the last couple weeks had a conflict and couldn’t come.”

Michael: “and I think the platform is a really exciting opportunity, but it could benefit from some of that design work because in our experience it’s really best used for print media and that’s what it was initially designed around and that’s not necessarily the needs of language

communities, always, and we found it to be troublesome in how it worked for digital recordings of speakers and those sort of things.”

Mandana: she had a discussion with someone who wanted to use Mukurtu with a community, but the biggest problem is the platform wasn't logical for the community creating metadata for searches because the type of searches required “a particular kind of literacy that they are not engaging with.”

Michael: “but it's a wonderful set of code bases that exist to work from, I think it's got fantastic potential.”

Gary: “and when talk about a Type 4, I mean I know it's [Mukurtu] designed as a content management system rather than an archive but there's a lot of communities out there who are using Mukurtu as a solution to archiving.”

Christina: asks the group for any other dissemination advice for the next few years. Since there were no other comments, she believes it is ready to shift to summaries and conclusion. “One thing that we were thinking about, as we continue this effort, that we would like to invite everyone if they would be interested in some kind of some advisory group, or advisory board to continue this effort, to give advice as we move forward. Or if individuals want to contact me and say yes or no. I know I'm being very vague because I myself don't know exactly what this would look like.”

Gary: or other people who aren't in this room that might be a part of this.

Mandana: “what are you asking?”

Christina: “I'm not sure what form it should really take, it will definitely take the form of questions from time to time, and requests for advice on issues.”

[25:19]

Gary: adds that “in terms of getting feedback as we move forward with coming up with recommendations and thinking about future funding proposals and how to move forward with some of the proposed test cases, asking if you guys would be a sounding board, advisory board of some sort.” He admits they're trying to be vague because they don't want this to be too much work.

Those who agree to be part of the advisory board are:

- Susan
- Mandana
- Wesley
- Felix
- Michael
- Andrea

Others nod their heads as well