Conversion Strategy for Legacy MS Office Word Documents in RUcore

Beard reviewed the volume and status of legacy MS Word documents in RUcore, along with challenges and next steps to convert them to Office Open XML files. The current number of impacted files within the repository is relatively small. It was decided that he should go ahead and convert the .doc files to .docx, but still maintain the original files. Since the file count is manageable no programming changes will be made to automatically convert new legacy files as they are added to RUcore. Instead, Beard will establish a simple process and timeline to convert these files on a scheduled basis. He will also investigate best practices for file conversion at the deposit stage.

Additionally, Beard provided statistics for the number of legacy MS Office files on the Alexander and TSB T drives. This led to a discussion concerning what types of files are appropriate for faculty and staff to store their respective T drives. Personal files should not be stored on the T drive. Agnew said guidelines and standards for T drive usage need to be established. As a first step she asked Brennan to analyze the TSB T drive with the goal of cleaning out old files and identifying usage issues so a reasonable strategy could be developed. Morgan asked if all T drives could be made easily accessible, noting it is a cumbersome process to map to T drives at other locations. Purger said the system-wide consolidation of T drives is still in process and should be completed by the end of the calendar year. When that is done shortcut icons to the various T drives will be pushed to faculty and staff desktops.

Draft Procedures for WordPress and Omeka Site Hosting

White and Giannetti reviewed a draft of the procedures developed by the Digital Humanities Working Group for RUL hosting of WordPress and Omeka websites. Purger recommended adding an introductory paragraph which states the rationale of this service and ensuing procedures. He also suggested using less specific technical jargon and more general language throughout the document.

Agnew advised carefully clarifying the scope – why the focus will be on digital humanities and why it is critical for that discipline. She said it was important to clearly state what RUL’s role will be while also establishing a dividing line between what we can and cannot provide. RUL is not a website provider for the university. As a starting point this service should strongly encourage faculty and students to use RUL resources, particularly since it will be supported by RUL staff and hosted on RUL servers. Additional discussion followed concerning managing the level of user expectation, ensuring solid security protocols, developing procedures for content management platforms, and archiving any sites which are established through this service.
White and Giannetti will redraft the document and incorporate the feedback, particularly why this is solely a digital humanities initiative. They will give additional careful consideration to the scope and the target audience. Cabinet will be the final arbiter of this and it is important to provide information which will allow them to make a considered decision. The intent is to review the new draft at the September 23 CISC meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, 2015 at 10:00 in the Technical Services Building conference room.
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