

MINUTES
RUetd Working Group
September 15, 2009

Present: Rhonda Marker (Chair), Kalaivani Ananthan, Marty Barnett, Isaiah Beard, Chad Mills, Jane Otto, Charlotte Toke, Jeffery Triggs, Bob Warwick

Rhonda presents the purpose of the meeting is to get organized for a shared understanding of the group's work. Specific issues will be discussed at this meeting as time permits. The group will review its seven-point charge and determine how best to carry it out:

1. Ensure that all graduate schools are able to use the RUetd system by the end of FY10.

We expect completion by next June, for dissertations. There are six schools; four are required to submit dissertations online and are actively using the system. Newark and New Brunswick have been sending through some masters theses (Cook, some science schools). Camden is also submitting masters theses; it has only one PhD program thus far and no dissertations are expected for two more years; two more Camden PhD programs will be approved this month. Other schools are PhD only. GSE is on the verge of being mandatory. Mason Gross is problematic, largely due to rights issues (rights issues for the students' own creative work, and issues for cited works). The school is also ambivalent about releasing certain types of material, including some performance art documentation. The school will have to work out these issues, with our facilitating.

We hope to normalize masters theses by the end of this year, but a comprehensive list of schools awarding masters theses still needs to be compiled.

Some undergraduate honors papers are of very high quality and candidates for inclusion, but we are not necessarily aiming for these this year.

2. Ensure that the changing needs of graduate schools are surveyed at least annually to ensure a service responsive to their needs.

A survey could be placed on the RUetd system, perhaps during the spring, if that's when most papers are submitted. Would it be students, or the schools, receiving the survey? Is a formal survey necessary, or could this part of the charge be addressed through annual meeting with the schools, either in individual meetings, or in a meeting of all the schools? Ideally there would be a half-day retreat with everybody talking to each other as well as to us. See also below under point 5.

3. Continue to revise, improve and align the OpenETD software to support the needs of Rutgers University and to leverage advances in the RUcore architecture

This point in the charge logically follows on the first two, and will be carried out easily as long as this group is meeting. Note the distinction between RUetd and OpenETD; RUetd is an

instance of OpenETD. Not all RUetd functions are appropriate for OpenETD. Changes are well documented in software.libraries.edu. A complete list of Open ETD items can be drawn from this source for any report we submit. Chad, Marty, and Kalaivani are the key people who develop and support OpenETD.

4. Develop and document an efficient workflow for the RUetd process that includes an annual timeline with checks for workflow issues, ETDs that fall through the cracks, etc. Workflow must encompass the OpenETD application, the RUcore implementation of OpenETD, relevant components of the RUcore architecture, the RUetd website, including search, retrieval and display of ETDs, any user applications or interfaces associated with RUetd, WMS cataloging, SIRSI Unicorn MARC ingest, export to UMI and the release of OpenETD.

Releases can necessitate downtime, so changes that are tied to repository releases must be considered in tandem with the submission timeline. In addition to the processes identified in the charge, we also need to decide the retention period for ETDs in the WMS. Backup and backlogs are part of the issue. Embargoing is an additional complication; currently this is a manual process. Rhonda will add the timeline issue to the next meeting agenda.

Everyone involved with ETDs must be able to locate an ETD that is in process. One suggestion was to develop a Gantt chart or something similar. Details of current progress were shared: 2008 ETDs have been sent to ProQuest. It is the group's understanding that metadata going to ProQuest includes metadata (from within RUetd) directing ProQuest to embargo.

Marty will verify this for October ETDs and after.

5. Develop communications procedures to keep graduate schools, students, faculty, library liaisons and others appropriately informed and involved as needed. Report regularly at CISC meetings and at least once annually to LRC, USC, and CSC. All minutes should be posted on a website available to everyone at RUL and their availability announced.

CISC will be asked if the web pages, to include minutes, can be set up in the developers area of the RUcore website. [DONE] If so, they will be posted there and a link sent to RUL-Everyone. The workflow and timeline can also be posted there.

Chad will determine if this will then appear on the RUL site map.

Rhonda will also set up an electronic discussion list. [DONE] Another discussion list could include reviewers and grad school administrators, and they could use the list to ask questions.

Rhonda will add two standing agenda items for each meeting: 1) enumerate action items, and 2) summarize reports that we will make to other groups. At that point in each meeting, we will determine who will distribute the message(s). Reports should go to CISC, LRC, USC, CSC, Software Architecture, Metadata Working Group. It was noted that no members of this working group are on LRC or USC.

6. Work with the Software Architecture and Metadata Working Groups as needed to accomplish the work of this group.

In addition to the processes outlined above, we identified these members of other groups:

CSC: Jane

Software Arch WG: Kalaivani, Isaiah, Rhonda, Chad, Jeffery

Metadata WG: Kalaivani, Rhonda, Jane, Charlotte

CISC: Kalaivani, Isaiah, Rhonda, Chad

7. Identify any workflow issues, such as single points of failure, workflow backlogs, etc. and any software or staffing needs to be addressed within CISC or by the AUL for Digital Library Systems, or other relevant group.

These will be revealed in the process of addressing point (4). Rhonda will create a spreadsheet with columns for Workflow step, single point of failure, workflow backlog, software need, and staffing need. We will need a regular review of documents, e.g., workflow, spreadsheet.

Items to be reported out from this meeting:

- The group has been established
- Members
- Summary of charge
- See the group's site

Chad will get approval for putting our site on the RUcore developers site. If that's not an option, it will go to www.libraries.

We have a Sakai site to share documents before they are made public.

Discussion of export to IRIS: Marty will release everything to the MSS3 RUcore server, through graduation date May 2009, unless embargoed. ETDs will be simultaneously released to ProQuest, although this should wait two months after graduation to catch stragglers. (If August passes without a paper, it's an October degree.) Rhonda will ask the schools if we must wait two months to send to ProQuest. This may vary from school to school.

There was discussion of special characters and what can be done to ensure text comes into SIRSI as UTF-8. A universal solution is required, as the problem occurs in all applications. This is already on the agenda for Software Architecture's September 17 meeting.

Jane requests an enhancement: email notification when the ETDs are ready for editing. In the meantime, Marty will email the group. Charlotte will keep statistics. A spreadsheet recording numbers, batch (e.g., May 2009), date, etc., can go on the Sakai site. Jane will record numbers from email notifications. Rhonda proposes establishing a timeline and publishing that, rather than sending out emails when things are done. We could have a status page showing when something is on the WMS server, when sent to Fedora, etc.

Graduation dates are

- May 2009
- October 2009
- January 2010

Next meeting will be October 13, 2009, at 10:00 a.m., TSB Conference room.

Kalaivani needs to give Bob the October 2008 ETDs, which are currently in RUcore and ready for loading into the SIRSI review file. Bob will be out for a month, beginning Monday.

Jeffery Triggs is Kalaivani's backup for preparing the MARC export file from RUcore.