Dr. Helen R. Tibbo, Ph.D., Professor
Phone# (919) 962-8063
Fax# (919) 962-8071
E-mail: TIBBO@ILS.UNC.EDU

School of Information and Library Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB# 3360, 201 Manning Hall
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3360

January 26, 2004

J. Dane Hartgrove, Director for Technology Initiatives
NHPRC
National Archives & Records Administration
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20408-0001

Dear Mr. Hartgrove:

This report presents our progress from July 1 - December 31, 2003 on the "Managing the Digital University Desktop" desktop project at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University.

1. We completed our 100th in-depth faculty/staff interview on July 14, 2003. We spoke with 50 people at UNC and at Duke, including 33 faculty members and 67 staff employees. After finishing this initial round of interviews, and hearing participants' comments regarding information technology, we developed a set of questions to ask the technology staff at both UNC and Duke. (See Appendix A.) In August, we interviewed 16 IT staff members at UNC and 3 at Duke. These interviewees were from a wide variety of positions – ranging from campus-wide director level positions to department support.

2. After finishing the IT interviews, we learned how to use the NVIVO qualitative research software to code and analyze our interview data. Since we already had our interview notes in electronic format, we only needed to do a small amount of reformatting in order to be able to use the data in NVIVO. We imported each interview into an NVIVO database.

3. We created a set of codes to use for all 74 questions of the original interview protocol by reading the responses to each question and determining the codes per question. Although the codes were created with specific questions in mind, the themes are such that the majority of the codes can be applied to more than one question. We have been coding the qualitative data for each question using the established codes. The NVIVO software has been especially helpful in applying these codes. The software provides us the flexibility to rename codes, compare coding done by different coders, and run reports on specific questions. We have divided this task between three coders, and have been comparing our use of the codes as we apply them as a quality control. In addition to double-coding some questions, we are also developing definitions of the codes with examples of text from the interviews.

4. We have conducted an extensive review of the electronic records management and email policies of state governments across the US. Combing this research with our email survey results and preliminary themes from the interviews, the team has begun working on a set of "Frequently Asked Questions" regarding email management. The topics covered so far include:

> ➢ Is email considered an offical University record?

➢ When should I save email attachments?
➢ How do I file the email I need to keep?
➢ What email can I delete?
➢ Should I handle my personal email differently than my work email?
➢ What information should a printed email message include?

These FAQs are a work in progress and we plan on using them for discussion during our March workshop and board meeting.

5. We have been working on the agenda and details for the focus group workshop on March 10, 2003. In April 2003, the project team applied for and received $1,000 from the Roberston Scholarship Collaboration Fund, a program that encourages and supports joint UNC-CH and Duke cooperative projects, to support this meeting. Project staff will give a status report and present early drafts of e-mail management policies in the form of "Frequently Asked Questions" for discussion and feedback from the groups.

6. In August, Tibbo presented "Managing the Digital Desktop: Campus Confidential" at the Society of American Archivists 2003 Annual Meeting as part of the "To Have But Not to Hold: Issues of Institutional and Private Ownership of E-Mail Records" program session. This presentation gave an overview of the project, results from the survey, and conclusions from the analysis of concerns regarding privacy and security. It also deals with a few questions regarding privacy and security from the interviews. (See Appendix B for PowerPoint slides)

7. In July 2003, Megan (Winget) Barrett replaced Ruth Monnig as Project Manager. Megan has done a fantastic job coding the voluminous qualitative data and working with Kim Chang, Assistant Project Manager.

8. Objectives set out in proposal workplan for this period and progress made.

Training Project Managers in content analysis.	We have learned how to use NVIVO to code and analyze our data.
Content analysis of the field notes from interviews, screen printouts, and any audiotapes discussing electronic document management with participants.	This task has taken longer, but has yielded perhaps even richer data than we anticipated. We have finished coding ¾ of the questions. The questions that remain to be coded are the ones that have complex varied responses. This activity is the core or our research and requires care and attention as our findings will turn on this analysis.
Analysis of the filing schemes found on participants' e-mail and other desktop systems [data from interviews and printouts of e-mail folder lists]	We have begun to compare the computer print-out screens of the participants emails with their responses to the interview questions regarding file structures.
Comparisons of electronic filing schemes with subjects' print filing schemes as appropriate [data from interviews]	Due to the length of our interviews and the number we conducted we were unable to obtain precise filing schemes for print materials (i.e., in filing cabinets) but did ask each interviewee how their print and electronic filing schemes related.

Comparison of electronic filing schemes with appropriate records schedules for a unit or person as appropriate.	We have identified which interviewees are members of departments that have records management schedules and have obtained copies of those schedules. When we have finished analyzing their filing schemes from the printouts we can then compare them to the schedules. This aspect of the research does not apply to any of the Duke data as Duke has no records schedules in place at this time and have just hired their first records manager in November 2003.
Description and comparison of the technical capabilities of various desktop applications and servers used at UNC-CH, Duke, and on the other campuses involved in the study.	We have identified the most used software packages mentioned in the interviews and have been reviewing the features of each software program. We will use this information to inform analysis of what people might do versus what they are doing.
Comparison of UNC-CH, Duke, and UNC-System participants' desktop management practices and available systems to other systems and schemes discussed in the literature.	We need to finish all of the above analyses before we can tackle this one.
Investigation of ERMS system features for UNC-CH and Duke.	We have been told by highly placed IT staff at UNC that there is next to no hope for installation of an ERMS system at UNC any time in the foreseeable future. The same appears to be true at Duke as well. This was our original premise but reviewers of our proposal wanted this task included. At this point there appears to be many other tasks on which to spend our time that will yield more important results than this one which we will hold in abeyance.
Presentation of early findings at SAA conference Results	Tibbo presented "Managing the Digital Desktop: Campus Confidential" at the Society of American Archivists 2003 Annual Meeting

Please let me know if there is any other material you would like to see in this report. We have been slogging through the qualitative data that takes a huge amount of time and patience but we are emerging to the interesting part of this project soon. The building of the FAQs for the Robertson meeting in March make clear that existing guidelines that say things like "create a filing scheme to match your paper files" do not have a sound basis when handling email. Moreover, we found few people actually attempted to do this. Paper files are built not just for storage but for retrieval. Full text capabilities in the electronic world make retrieval often the easy part (no one complained they couldn't find materials), but the volume of email messages and electronic files that accumulate call for approaches that facilitate "deletion management." Insight such as this will lead to interesting and hopefully very useful products in the last year of this project.