Chronicles Advisory Group Minutes
2013/06/21

Attendees:
Liz Bishoff (Bishoff Consulting)
Frederick Zarndt (Digital Divide Data/DL Consulting)
Nick Krabbenhoeft (Educopia Institute)
Robert Horton (IMLS)
Mary Molinaro (University of Kentucky)

Topics:
1. Nick Krabbenhoeft (Educopia Institute) opened the meeting by explaining the current status of the Guidelines as written by Matt Schultz (Educopia Institute) and Katherine Skinner (Educopia Institute). He then asked the Advisory Group for any comments on the Guidelines.
   a. Liz Bishoff (Bishoff Consulting), Frederick Zarndt (Digital Divide Data/DL Consulting), Robert Horton (IMLS), and Mary Molinaro (University of Kentucky) were extremely positive about the content of the document.
   b. The group suggested offering a number of methods to improve the accessibility of the document such as:
      i. prefacing the document with an index
      ii. connecting the Checklist to the sections with hyperlinks
      iii. offering explicit instructions on how to use the document from essential and optimal workflows
      iv. creating two derivative pamphlets focused on just essential and optimal measures.
      v. including more graphics and diagrams that explain concepts in the text
      vi. visually distinguishing the general, technical, and other portions of each section.
   c. Robert and Frederick questioned whether the document was overly text-heavy and if this would deter the potential audience from using it, especially if they’re looking for specific answers to specific questions.
      i. Liz responded that while the text is dense, the documents had to address everything, not just singular problems. Mary agreed, emphasizing that the Guidelines were a combination of resources not available anywhere else, and that they’re complexity reflected the complexity of the topic.
      ii. Robert recommended editing for long sentences, long paragraphs, and overly technical language to increase the readability of the document.
   d. The group finished the meeting discussing the intended audience of document.
i. From the perspective of someone with experience in the field, Mary felt the guidelines spoke well to audiences with experience.

ii. Liz agreed with Mary’s assessment of addressing experienced audiences but felt the guidelines were too complex for the average staff of a local historical society.
   1. Robert believed that audience was out of scope for the guidelines.

iii. The group agreed that they would appreciate a stronger definition of the audience for the documents from Katherine and Matt.