

**The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Scholarly Communications and Information Technology Program**

GRANT REPORTING COVER SHEET

Date of Submission	July 9, 2013	
Legal Name of Grantee	Regents of the University of California (Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative, Berkeley)	
Project		
Project Title	Editorial Practices and the Web	
Reference Number		
Original Award Amount	\$	
Grant Balance	\$	
Interest Credited to Date	\$	
Reporting Period	April 2012 – March 2013	
Award Period	April 2010 – March 2013	
Principal Investigator(s) and Title(s)		
Name(s)	Michael K Buckland	
Email(s)	buckland@berkeley.edu	
<i>For Internal Use Only</i>		
<i>Date Received</i>		
<i>Date Reviewed</i>		
<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Pending</i>	

1. Objectives:

Scholarly annotated editions of historically significant texts constitute an important foundation for learning and research in the Humanities. Scholarly editing requires a sustained investment of highly specialized expertise, but funding is difficult. Existing editorial procedures are still rooted in the pre-digital work practices and space constraints of the printed codex.

The objective of this project was to show how current Web technology can be used with a change in editorial work practices to achieve a gain in efficiency through shared access to working notes within and between related projects; more effective interoperability with other scholarly infrastructure; and an increased return on investment by making the editors' work promptly available to all.

No changes were made to the objectives.

Clarification: There is widespread interest in the *annotation* of texts. Our focus is broader. We are concerned with notes themselves, including but not limited to their use in annotation.

2. Deliverables:

The primary deliverable was a shared website used by three collaborating documentary editing projects for their working notes:

- The Emma Goldman Papers Project (University of California, Berkeley);
- The Margaret Sanger Papers (New York University); and
- The Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony Papers Project (Rutgers, The State University).

In addition, to demonstrate the feasibility of wider interoperability with other scholarly infrastructure, library special collection curators' notes were added by the Labadie Collection (University of Michigan).

3. Accomplishments:

That the project achieved its stated objectives as is demonstrated by the shared website and the collaborating editing projects willingness to continue. See

<http://editorsnotes.org/>

In August 2012 password control to the site was quietly removed making the site openly available to both humans and webcrawlers. By September, after Web search engines, including Google, Bing, and Baidu (China), had indexed the contents, the resources on the Editors' Notes site were being viewed by scholars from around the world.

An unforeseen benefit: Using a shared Web site facilitates the management of a large editorial project because a senior editor can more easily see, monitor, and add comments and instructions to the work of assistants.

4. Challenges:

Administrative delays at the beginning of the project and frugality in expenditures resulted in some funds remaining at the end of the second year, so a one-year no-cost extension was requested as well as a proposal for a sequel Phase 2. We are very grateful that both requests were approved. However, the funds carried forward into the extension were insufficient to sustain momentum for the twelve months before the new grant became available. Fortunately, this difficulty was largely mitigated by additional financial support from the Coleman Fung Foundation's "Knowledge Unix" grant to the Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative to support examination of ways to make recorded knowledge interoperable.

5. Project Personnel:

The Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony Papers Project at Rutgers ended September 30, 2012, and employed no staff after that date. Their work for our project was completed before that date.

No other significant changes since the last reporting period.

6. Publications:

In addition to the openly accessible editorsnotes.org website at <http://editorsnotes.org/>, a project website is separately maintained at <http://ecai.org/mellon2010/> with a page listing the numerous presentations and publications relating to this project usually with links to the text or slides used: <http://metadata.berkeley.edu/mellon2010publ.htm>
A general overview of the project is forthcoming as book chapter. Preprint is at <http://metadata.berkeley.edu/digdocbuckland.pdf>

A series of short specialized papers address the use of linked open data in relation to documentary editing.

Presentations at major academic and professional meetings include the American Society for Information Science and Technology, the California Society of Archivists, the Coalition for Networked Information, the Fourth Conference on Digital Documents and Society (Zadar, Croatia), Digital Humanities 2013, and the Taiwan e-Learning & Digital Archives Program (TELDAP).

Further presentations and publications are planned.

7. Intellectual Property:

All of the source code for Editors' Notes is available at

<https://github.com/editorsnotes/editorsnotes>.

All of our source code is licensed under the AGPL (GNU Affero General Public License): <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/agpl.html>.

Everything we rely on (third-party software) is likewise openly licensed.

8. Future Plans:

This was the final year of the grant. However, this project made a pivotal shift in editorial work practice, opening up numerous worthwhile possibilities which we intend to pursue as opportunities and resources permit. The very welcome new grant for a Phase 2 will enable us to make a good start.

Expansion: We hope to help other editing projects to adopt the same or a similar approach.

Technical Extensions: The technical goals were modest: Editors' working notes, mainly in plain text, moved to a shared web environment. However, this is a pivotal change, because it provides a basis for deploying powerful tools for making links, enriching data, and making visualizations and complex data analysis. The challenge is to provide that functionality through software integration and interface design at very low thresholds of user effort. We plan on adding or refining the following components to the Editors' Notes system architecture:

1. Note-making tools
2. Reconciliation & linked data import tools
3. Backend storage of arbitrary linked data
4. Linked data editing and authoring tools

5. Sorting, filtering, and visualization

Names and Persons: Names are always a challenge for historical research. For example, Dorothy Hamilton Brush, a close friend of Sanger's, appears in documents variously as Dorothy Adams Hamilton, Dorothy Brush, Dorothy Dick, and Dorothy Wamsley. Nicknames, children who share names with their parents or grandparents, and transliteration to and from non-Roman scripts add complexity. The standard approach is to maintain name authority databases could be improved upon by linking the local name authority database into a network of name authority files in other projects and external authorities such as VIAF. (Linking establishes a connection without requiring adoption of the form of name used at the source linked to.) Likewise with events, institutions, places, and other relationships.

Preservation and Access: Individual editing projects eventually end. When the manuscript of the final volume is ready for publication, the editors and staff retire or move on and their working notes become effectively inaccessible if not discarded. Grants do not (yet) fund the preservation of the editors' working papers. Ordinarily little more than expensive printed volumes survive. Low-cost procedures could keep these editorial resources accessible as an archival resource.

The relationship between the editorial working notes and the published editions should be reconsidered. Instead of the published editions being the one and only product, the editorial "workshop" (expertise and working notes) could be an enduring asset and the published editions intermittent valued by-products.

Institutional and funding patterns favor editing projects based on the papers of a single important individual or organization. This provides an attractive and practical introduction to history, but editing requires examination of context, so the more that the contextual notes can be shared, the better the personality-based projects can also support the history of groups and themes in social history.

9. Financial Narrative

As noted in #4 above, the central challenge was to sustain continuity for the project for the full twelve months before funding for Phase 2 became available in April 2013. We achieved this in two ways. We made economies where we could and redirecting savings to support the research assistant on the Central Team. We were also fortunate in being able to draw on additional support from other sources, primarily from a grant to the Electronic Cultural Atlas by the Coleman Fung Foundation.

Economies were made by minimizing equipment and supplies, determining that we could manage without an intended final project-wide meeting, and avoiding expected software purchases.

One subcontractor felt able to manage without invoicing for all of the amount budgeted. That saving was applied to Personnel.

Expenditures reflect higher than expected increases in fringe benefit rates.

Remaining Balance: \$37.56

Interest Credited to Date: \$14,160.00

Interest Credited since previous report: \$959.39

10. **Endowment Reporting:** Not applicable.