

Transcript from Recordings at Risk Cycle 10 Q&A Webinar, March 8, 2023

Sharon Burney: Hello, everyone, and welcome to the applicant Q&A Webinar for the tenth call of the Recordings at Risk program, we're really glad that you are able to join us today.

Our time together will be filled with your questions. We did have a few slides to share prior to those. So we want to begin with an overview and a few reminders about our platform A live transcript is being generated if you'd like to utilize it. To turn on this feature. Click the C.C. Live transcript button at the bottom of your zoom window.

Attendees will be muted throughout the presentation. However, you're welcome to use chat for general introductions and conversation. If a chat box isn't already displaying on your zoom screen, you can hover your mouse towards the bottom of the screen and open it manually in order to send a message to everyone. Remember to change the default from all panelists to all panelists and attendees.

We ask that you use a separate Q&A box to ask questions. This can be opened the same way as the chat box, but because we have a limited time together, please for free to follow along with questions as they come in and upvote them to let us know that it would be helpful to you to have them answered live! We will do our best to answer all of the questions live, but we will also share responses to all questions alongside the recording and speaking of recording the session, recording and transcript will be made available on the [Apply for an Award page](#) of our website following this event.

And right now we're going to start with a poll. So I'm gonna ask you, the first question on our poll is, how confident are you regarding your ability to create a Recordings at Risk proposal?

I'm getting those in right now...and most of them looks like 80%, almost, and somewhat confident. So that's good to know. We will take another one at the end and see how it comes out. I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Alyson.

Alyson Pope: Thanks, Sharon. I'm Alyson Pope and I'm joined today by my fellow program Officer Sharon Burney. We'll be answering all of your questions during our time together. We're also supported today by our colleagues, Louisa Kwasigroch, whose picture is not loading for some reason sorry Louisa, Christa Williford, Lizzi Albert, and Jennifer Feretti. We also want to thank the team from AI media for their assistance with live transcription today.

Before we get to the open session of Q&A, we've had a lot of questions about eligible materials, so we wanted to take a quick moment to highlight a few of the AV formats that have come up recently. In sharing this, we want to re-emphasize that there is no definitive list of eligible materials. We continue to encounter unusual AV formats that fit the priorities of this program. Consider whether or not the materials you have on hand fit. Remember that this program was designed to prioritize at-risk, time-based analog materials for preservation through digitization. This program does not support file migration for previously digitized or born digital materials. We continue to welcome your questions on this.

Sharon Burney: Thank you, Alyson. Another question we get frequently in our inbox, and at these session to answer are concerning the Rights, Ethics, and Reuse section, which will help reviewers assess an applicant's understanding of the legal and ethical issues affecting access to the nominated content, and evaluate the proposed approach.

So we require you to dedicate all metadata to the public domain under a Creative Commons waiver, and to avoid imposing additional access restrictions on the reformatted recordings than what may already be in place for the source recordings. So while this program does prioritize preservation over access, reviewers strongly prefer that applicants avoid creating unnecessary barriers, barriers to access. Since such barriers inhibit a project's impact.

Access restrictions are allowable when well justified due to the legal and or ethical concerns. Such restrictions will not necessarily disadvantage you in the competition and may even be viewed favorably by the review panel. This includes restricting access to recordings that include personally identifiable information or culturally sensitive material.

So I think that we are now going to stop the slides, and I'll start asking some of your answering some of your questions that have been submitted. Let's see which one...the first one is: Can we include stipends for the PIs in our budget?

The Recordings at Risk program was set up as a small budget primarily for the reformatting of these materials to digitize forms. You can add staff if that is the project manager for your project, the PI. You can add salaries, but just keep in mind to be a competitive application that you want to have a fiscally sound budget that prioritizes the digital reformatting, but also can include a stipend for the PI as a project manager in the assistance of those. So yes, I guess the answer is yes, in short form. But to whenever you're doing budgetary narratives, make sure that you explain your expenditures very thoroughly, so that the review panel can make a complete decision on your proposal.

Alyson Pope: I'm gonna hop to a question that I know, Christa answered in the Q&A text session, but it's one that may apply to other people who have been previous recipients: As recipients of clear Cycle 8, we would like to digitize the rest of our tapes. The project will be similar to the last one. Would it be necessary to change the title of the project? Changes for the new project are only the dates of the tapes and a few technical details.

As Christa has responded, it would not be necessary to change the title, but we would encourage a phrase like Phase 2. We have a lot of projects that get phased in that fashion to make clear to everyone that you're asking for support to do new work.

Sharon Burney: There was a question. Please remind me if there's any cost share requirement for the Recordings at Risk program, and no there is no required cost share.

Alyson Pope: So we have a couple of questions about letters of support: In a collaborative university setting, from where should the institutional letter of support originate? The materials and PI are in our libraries, the award would be managed by our research foundation.

I believe that that could come from the library director or a dean that has oversight of the department. We have a lot of universities that we have awarded to in the past, and we're used to working with the OSP or the OPAM. But they're not necessarily the people that would be providing that kind of letter of support.

And we also have someone who's nervous about scholars, asking them to write letter of support. How willing have you found people in being open to writing support letters?

That's not necessarily something that we have direct experience with, but we do frequently have applications that come in with multiple letters of support, more than we require. I think that the people that are passionate about the materials that you're going to be making available tend to be pretty excited about talking about that process and talking about their research. If anything, we sometimes get letters of support that are a little bit long, and we do have guidelines for authors of letters of support on the program's [Apply for an Award page](#), and we'll drop the link to that page in the chat, so you can check out those guidelines.

Sharon Burney: We have a question: The collection I'm thinking of submitting has some oral histories on Cds. They are not the original format the interviews were recorded in, but they are all that we have, and we would like to get them off of this format, will such material fall within the category of digital file migration which is not eligible.

So this is a gray area for formatting. We understand that the formats are changing every day. I would encourage you one to understand as well that the Recordings at Risk program is a very competitive program. We use an outside review panel, and you want to make the clearest and more concise, compelling narrative for the use of these materials. DVDs and CDs sometimes fall within the bounds. It depends on if the entire collection is already what we would consider born digital. If you have a collection that also includes other materials primarily, that are are not CDs or DVDs, then I would include that into the collection that you're proposing to digitize.

And if anybody wanted to add to that, we get this question a lot, and you just want to create the most impactful proposal based on the guidelines, and compelling and competitive proposal as possible. But yeah, that's one of the borderline formats.

Alyson Pope: I'm gonna take a question that is from Rory that Christa had some follow up on: Can we count in-house digital processing time as a direct cost? And then he clarified what in-house digital processing time refers to for him is metadata creation and other tasks directly related to making files available online.

So the program does require that you use an outside vendor for digitization, but other tasks related to the project like metadata creation is something that you can do in house. Particularly when we work with, for instance, indigenous tribes. They may need to do some translation work or transcription work that can be done by them rather than by the vendor. Only the digitization piece has to be outsourced, but it does have to be outsourced to a vendor.

Sharon Burney: I have a question here. We are in the middle, locating all of the videos in auto re audio recordings prior to creating complete inventory. Since we don't know the exact number of videotapes - 1/2" reel to reel, VHS, 3/4" U-Matic and audio cassettes and open reel, will we be able to supply estimates?

Yeah, we usually get estimates sometimes when people put their collections list, you, you know, until the vendor gets on you typically don't know what kind of condition they're going to be in, because these are recordings that are at risk. However, we do encourage you to also have some items on stand by that are connected to the collection that you may be able to substitute for the estimates, but to get as close an estimate as possible to the number, because you will be filling out a collections list, and we'd like to have as concise estimate as possible, so it might also encourage you to have somebody, or have a vendor have somebody to look at what you have prior to submitting it to get as close to the number that you'll be asking to get digitized by

the vendor, because we will need a vendor. Well, we would like to have a vendor quote prior to added to your application. So I hope that answers your question.

Alyson Pope: I'm going to pop over to a question that Christa typed an answer to: Data DATs are ineligible as born digital materials, correct?

DAT is fragile media, and reformatting them is actually eligible for the program. So if you go to our program's Apply for an Award page, under the FAQ we have a full explanation of allowable formats, and that's also something that's covered in our Guidelines as well, which you can find on the [Apply for an Award page](#).

There's a lot of access to the materials needed to digitize DVDs. In most institutions there's not a lot of access to the type of materials needed to digitize a rare format like DAT.

Sharon Burney: Looks like Joseph has some additional information to the question. Joseph, was your question the oral history question?

Christa Williford: Yes, Sharon, that's correct. The majority of the collection is Mini DV, and that is an explicitly allowable format. And the CDs are a minor part of that. So, the right advice.

Sharon Burney: Okay. Do you need any other? Is that answered completely for you, Joseph, or did you need further explanation?

Alyson Pope: I will expound on that question if Joseph doesn't need more specific information, we get a lot of this form of question that's about kind of these mixed collections, and what percentage of blank is allowable, and that goes back to Sharon's statement about competitive proposals for our review panel. We do have current projects where they have large collections with a handful of CDs that were supplementary, or materials of that nature. But what we can't do, because we utilize an independent review panel, is provide you like a set cut-off of a percentage, or a number of items, that is really up to them, and it will depend on kind of how you tell the story of how all of those materials come together.

Sharon, do you want to take that question about tapes?

Sharon Burney: We have a variety of tapes that need to be digitize. They cover very distinct topics, such as public affairs, shows, debates, mental health shows, youth shows, etc. Are we required to get approval from CLIR first on subject matter, unless all materials be digitized to be digitized beyond the same theme, i.e. all public affairs shows from 1987 to 1990.

If I'm understanding your question correctly, I think it's important that your collection have some commonality in it. That also hits the core requirements for our program, including most important, is impact. So you would want to link them theme wise, either as a collection from, etc., etc. The theme show from this to this.

And also show a scholarly impact that is broad. And you know, even though it's local, what is the broad-based, scholarly impact for this collection? What makes this collection stand out. How is it important is in that, coupled with you know, the rarity and the condition of the risk of factor of the actual items. So that's not for us to decide. Once again this isn't a subject specific program as the Digitizing Hidden Collections one is. Now, however, you must substantiate proactively what competitively makes your collection of scholarly interest and impact.

Alyson Pope: I'm gonna take this question about vendor quotes: You mentioned that we need the vendors quotation for the digitization in our grant application. If there are changes to the statement of work within the grant period, how is that handled?

That would be handled through a grant modification request. And that's not an unusual thing to happen within the project term. We have institutions that are required to do specific bidding processes, and they may have to change the vendor entirely after the grant has been awarded. We have institutions that the condition of the tapes is not necessarily what was realized, and it needs more remediation, and they need to expand that portion of the budget by taking from somewhere else. And in any case where you want to do a reallocation within the budget that you provided with the proposal, you would do that through a grant modification request.

Now the one thing that is not available is that we cannot increase an award after it's given.

So if, for instance, you put in a budget for \$47,000, and then it ends up that that more remediation is needed, and you need an additional \$5,000. We would have to ask you to illustrate a cost share. We don't have the ability to increase the award.

Sharon Burney: Along the vendor line, we have a question: Your page mentioned that some government agencies cannot select a vendor ahead of time. We are getting proposals from a couple of vendors, but what's the best way to explain that the vendor is not set in stone?

You do have the ability to upload multiple vendor requests in the application and in your financial budget narrative. That's a good place for you to mention that you know we, our government agency, we're required to... Sometimes people are required to use certain vendors. Sometimes people are in organizations are required to have multiple, and once you explain and

choose your vendor, then you will explain, you know, in your narrative and in probably your project proposal why this vendor is the best choice for you, and some of the reasons why Alyson just answered in her question.

Sometimes you know what we find happens is not necessarily the least expensive is not necessarily the best choice, because it depends on the materials that you're proposing to digitize. Sometimes you may need to go local because the shipping is not convenient for you. Sometimes you will not have it into nearby. You might have to do a long-distance vendor. So your financial narrative, budget narrative is a place to explain your choices.

Alyson Pope: I think we have all the questions in the Q&A session done. Do we have any lurking in the chat?

Lizzi Albert: There was one question in the chat, which is the one you just answered. I think that was all. Everything else I believe was in the Q&A. And I'm showing them all answered. But if anyone has a question that hasn't been answered, please type it in.

Alyson Pope: Here we go. You guys just needed to be encouraged.

I'm gonna start with the question at the bottom. I see that the Cycle 10 guidelines and template includes a places to write a draft response, in your experience is it easier to cut in piece from a word or Pdf version?

I would probably use a Word version of the template and cut and paste into our SM Apply application system. It does have word count limits at some point within the application, so it is easier at times to draft at least those sections in an outside document, so you can get a word count, and it's easier to edit them externally, and it's also a good format to use if you're working collaboratively with multiple people, but it isn't required to be used. You can just work directly in SM Apply if you choose to do so.

Sharon Burney: I'm gonna take this: When we are working on a proposal for recordings that have mixed rights, consideration. We may have a copyright for some recordings. Some could be in the public domain, and others are recordings of television recordings that we clearly don't have the rights to publish. Would it make our proposal more competitive to exclude commercial news or other recordings, even if they are relevant to the subject matter?

Yeah, we understand that these things happen, and as some of the collections, you will not have the rights and ethics too. In your rights, ethics and reuse statement, if you clarify that and explain why that makes it easier for the review panel to understand the rights, ethics, and that

you know and understand what the rights, ethics and reuse policies are for the proposed materials hopefully. That it's not the majority of your materials which would make it, yeah, less competitive than others. But we find that reasonable and we understand that these things happen.

That's where you explain in your statement that you understand, that you know what is a readily available and accessible, which ones aren't, and why you're limiting to that, and you will explain all that in that section of your application. Clearly. I see that that not being any hindrance to creating a successful and competitive application.

Alyson Pope: How does CLIR define reasonable levels of access to materials digitized through the grant program? Do the recordings have to be made accessible online.

I would say, as a caveat that we do not necessarily define reasonable levels of access. That is something that is left to the viewers to interpret. It does typically mean that the recordings will be made available and accessible online. There are some instances where some portions of collections cannot be handled that way because of personally identifiable information, or culturally sensitive materials that can be addressed in the right ethics and reuse portion of the proposal. But if the entire bulk of the collection is simply kept in-house, you would have to make a pretty strong argument for the reasoning why to be competitive.

Alyson Pope: Oh, here we go: Does all the metadata have to be available online by the end...oops Christa is too fast for me!

Christa Williford: Sorry I just typed 'yes', but yeah, I think it a longer answer is probably better this. Does all of it (data) have to be available online by the end of the grant activity period, or can some of it be made available after the end of the grant period? We would like it to be?

Alyson Pope: Here's what we need to have happen by the end of the grant period. The funds that are going to be dispersed need to be dispersed. Money cannot be spent after the fact. And the deliverables that have been outlined in the proposal should be met.

We do have, one of the modifications that you can request during the grant term is a no-cost extension of either 6 or 12 months. We do grant one no cost extension per project. So if you find once you've gotten started, that things are taking a little bit longer than you anticipate, and you're going to have some left over work to do after the end of the grant term, you can apply for a no-cost extension to get that work done within the time required.

Sharon Burney: And let me expand on that a little bit, too. So all project deliverables and all monies must be expended prior to the project end date. And you get one no-cost extension of 6 months for Recordings at Risk. If there's extenuating circumstances way beyond your control, you may be able to get a second one, but that would also require Mellon Foundation approval prior. However, you can plan, for example sometimes people do outreach, and that type of stuff, that can happen after the project ending, be it none of the monies are spent for the outreach.

Alyson Pope: Don't spend money after your grant end date! This comes up a lot.

Lizzi Albert: I think there's a follow up to that in the Q&A.

Alyson Pope: So if the grant proposal includes the goal that all the recordings will be online, not just the metadata, are we obligated to get all those recordings uploaded? Yeah, that would be one of the deliverables that you want to have completed by the end of the grant term. So if you needed more time to do that, that would be a perfectly reasonable reason to request a no cost extension.

Sharon Burney: But keep in mind also to have a competitive application, that this program is a small, shorter program that we expect, the review panel will expect for the project to be able to be completed in 12 months. So when you think about the size of your collections, your project work, planning your digitization plan, it should be created on the model of a 12 month plan. And grant modifications are for the unexpected things that may occur to slow that down.

Is that it? Going once...

Okay, I think we have a couple of more slides.

Alyson Pope: Yeah, we have one more slide. Thank you.

And we're going to run our second Poll.

Sharon Burney: Yup.

How confident are you about your ability to create a Recordings at Risk proposal? Now that you completed our Q&A.

Okay, okay, it looks like 71% said they are more confident. That's good to know.

Alyson Pope: Thank you everyone for joining us today to learn about Recordings at Risk.

Within the next few days we should have the slides, transcript, written answers to today's questions, and the recording from this session posted to the [Apply for an Award page](#), where you can also find the guidelines and FAQs.

If you have additional questions, you can also always reach the CLIR Grants Team at recordings at risk at CLIR dot org. We all monitor the program's inbox and do our best to reply promptly. You can also keep up with us on Twitter at CLIRGrants

Don't forget. Applications are due April 19th, 2023. April 19th! Thanks to all of you for your interest in our program and for attending our session today, have a great afternoon and happy grant writing.

Sharon Burney: Thank you everyone.