



Report to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission
Survey and Analysis of the Six Founders Papers Projects

Submitted by
Documents Compass, a division of the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities
In fulfillment of NHPRC Grant #PT-50001
March 31, 2010



Report to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission
Survey and Analysis of the Six Founders Papers Projects

Contents

Executive summary p. iii
Survey methodology p. 6
Background on the Founding Fathers editions p. 6
Print publication status p. 8
Scholarly process p. 9
Project workflow p. 13
Online access p. 18
Technology and digital publication p. 19

Appendix A: Grouped questionnaire responses

Current state of collections p. 30
Project workflow – Adams p. 34
Project workflow – Franklin p. 38
Project workflow – Jefferson Papers p. 40
Project workflow – Jefferson: Retirement series p. 42
Project workflow – Madison p. 44
Project workflow – Washington p. 45
Technology status p. 46
Administrative issues p. 52
Projects in action p. 57

Appendix B: Full answers to questionnaire by each project

Adams p. 59
Franklin p. 63
Jefferson Papers p. 67
Jefferson: Retirement series p. 70
Madison p. 73
Washington p. 76

Executive Summary

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) of the National Archives asked Documents Compass to prepare a comparative analysis of the six ongoing research projects engaged in publishing the papers of the Founding Fathers. This report focuses on what the projects have already accomplished in terms of preparing comprehensive authoritative and annotated transcriptions of these writings, what remains to be done, and some of the opportunities and challenges posed in transitioning to a model for both online and print publication.

Five of these projects currently receive funds from the NHPRC to support their research on the writings of the Founders: The Papers of John Adams (Massachusetts Historical Society), the Papers of Benjamin Franklin (Yale University), the Papers of Thomas Jefferson (Princeton University), the Papers of James Madison (University of Virginia) and the Papers of George Washington (University of Virginia). A sixth editorial project, based at Monticello in Virginia, is focused on the retirement Papers of Thomas Jefferson and has not requested Commission support. These independent research projects were conceived in the 1940s and 1950s by scholars committed to publishing accurate transcriptions of the original documents along with explanatory text.

The Commission began funding these projects in the 1960s. Thus far the projects have published 221 volumes and received in excess of \$16 million dollars in funds from the National Archives. The NHPRC's contribution to each research project's total budget varies between 12 and 22 per cent. The projects report that their staffing levels range in size from 6 to 10 FTEs who are subject-matter experts in the history of the founding era and are skilled in working with handwritten materials of the 18th and 19th centuries. Depending on the size of the staff, these projects have traditionally produced between one and two volumes a year, with most volumes containing over 500 documents.

The work completed thus far by the Founding Fathers projects is described in more detail in the body of the report. To summarize, each project has:

- Amassed comprehensive facsimile collections of the writings of each individual, including both incoming and outgoing correspondence, diaries and account books. Drawn from multiple institutions, these copies of original manuscripts provide the basis for the transcription work as well as the annotations included with each document published.
- Published more than 100,000 documents in 221 volumes that include extensive indexes and introductory materials.
- Worked with partners to convert the already published volumes into online digital resources. Five of the six projects have partnered with the University of Virginia Press's Rotunda imprint in this effort. Rotunda's paid subscribers can search across the volumes as they become available online. Currently, the

works of the Adams, Jefferson Papers and Washington Papers are available. The printed volumes from the Jefferson Retirement and the Madison Papers projects are being converted for online availability via Rotunda. The Franklin Digital Edition is available free of charge through a website maintained by the Packard Humanities Institute, linked to the Franklin Papers project's website.

- Prepared preliminary transcriptions for the majority of the approximately 70,000 remaining documents that will complete these research projects.

The Founding Fathers projects still have work to complete. Our study shows the following:

- The six projects have a total of 123 additional volumes remaining. At least 21 of these volumes are already in preparation.
- These volumes will include approximately 70,000 documents, the majority of which have preliminary transcriptions that have been converted to a variety of digital formats. Final verification of these transcriptions still needs to be completed.
- The project teams need to complete the research and writing associated with final transcription and the document annotation.
- For each volume, the editors will prepare comprehensive indexes and front matter.
- The projects will work with their respective publishers to complete final versions of all materials for print and online publication.

Current plans call for these research projects to complete their work between 2021 and 2043. With the NHPRC's present level of funding, this will require an additional investment of approximately \$12 million dollars.

All of the editions originated as independent endeavors at different institutions and therefore do not operate with the same standards or conventions. In fact, each project uses a distinct set of workflow procedures to produce its volumes. Some project staffs take on activities — such as publishing layout — that extend into the traditional realm of publishing, while others contract out services. The result is that the projects' budgets and timetables differ. The variables that produce these differences range from salary to staff size to workflow, and project annual costs accordingly vary from \$500,000 to \$930,000. Based on information provided by each project, our calculations show that the cost to move a document from an original manuscript to a thoroughly-vetted transcription including annotation and indexing ranges from approximately \$750 to \$2,200 in current dollars. As stated above, this variation is a result of the differing number and complexity of activities included in the workflow plan, as well as the particular research needs and their publishing requirements.

For most of these projects, planning for both online and print publication has

occurred in the last few years. Current access to most digital editions was achieved through conversion of the print volumes. In the case of the Franklin Papers, the transcriptions of as-yet-unpublished material were double-keyboarded by an outside provider. As a result, it is difficult to draw conclusions about how these new workflows will change the rate of publication. The current plans of the projects for future digital publications are as follows:

- The Jefferson Retirement Series has created a workflow that permits preparation of print and online publication from a single source file. Print volumes have been published in this manner since 2004 and digital publication is scheduled for 2010. The Jefferson Papers project has submitted a volume for publication (vol. 37, not yet published) that permits preparation of print and online from a single source file.
- Two of the projects, Adams and Washington, are poised to prepare future volumes for both online and print publication.
- Two of the projects, Franklin and Madison, expect to transfer digital files to other partners that will result in online publications.

As each project adopts new methods, our research indicates that presentation of the work in a single, online publication will require additional work. At a minimum, indexing terms will need to be standardized among the projects to aid searching. In addition, the projects will likely have to adopt standards for presentation of transcriptions. Although some of these issues were resolved in converting the already published volumes to online publication, it is clear that additional refinements will be necessary as the online work proceeds.

Susan Perdue
Susan Severtson
Holly Shulman
Documents Compass, Charlottesville, Virginia

Survey methodology

Prior to embarking on this survey in 2009, Documents Compass (DC)—in consultation with the NHPRC—compiled a list of questions to outline the information that this study should gather. The questions were designed to help us understand the current state of the projects, their workflow and production methodology, their use of technology, status regarding electronic publication, and how these things relate to their mission. To answer these questions, DC made an on-site visit to each project, followed by a period of follow-up communication to clarify and correct all responses. The narrative below brings together the information gathered, as well as an analysis and comparison that is designed to give an overview of the status of all six Founders projects. Following this overview, Appendix A shows each question listed, together with standardized answers from each project, to allow for comparison on a question-by-question basis. Appendix B shows the full set of answers from each project, unedited.

Background on the Founding Fathers editions

The scholarly effort to compile a complete and reliable version of the Founding Fathers writings began with the publication of the first volume of the Jefferson Papers in 1950. This volume and the founding era volumes that followed it include incoming and outgoing correspondence, a reliable printed text of each document, information on the document's provenance, and explanatory and contextual annotation to enable the reader to understand the historical context of the document. An important part of the development of these research enterprises was the federal support for documentary-based work through the National Historical Publications Commission (NHPC), created in 1934, and the Federal Records Act of 1950.¹ New technologies have periodically altered the workflow of these projects. The photocopier, for example, made it possible for projects to obtain images of original documents. The World Wide Web has transformed scholarly and public communications, providing new opportunities as well as challenges for these projects.

This report is an analysis of the methods of six Founding Fathers projects in the first decade of the twenty-first century. These projects—the Papers of John Adams, the Papers of Benjamin Franklin, the Papers of Thomas Jefferson, the Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series, the Papers of James Madison, and the Papers of George Washington—have a long tradition of scholarly publishing that goes back over half a century. From their inception, the documentary editions of the Founding Fathers set the standard for the quality of such publications. Under the guidance of distinguished historians and editors such as Lyman H. Butterfield (Adams), Leonard W. Labaree (Franklin), Julian P. Boyd (Jefferson), William E. Rachal (Madison), and William W.

¹ The NHPC became the National Historical Publications and Records Commission NHPRC on 22 December 1974 (Public Law 93-536).

Abbot (Washington), the founding editions became the benchmark for what scholars and the public have come to expect: access to the thoughts and events of this period in the development of the American nation.

To do this work, each of the Founding Fathers projects has had to develop methods to obtain the documents and present them to the public. Much like a research laboratory determines what staff, equipment and samples they need in order to conduct scientific research, these historical projects have assembled teams of skilled scholars. Each project has a staff of between 6 and 10, most of whom are trained in the history of the period and expert in the particular biography of the individual on whom each edition is focused.

Likewise, they have assembled comprehensive research collections that make their work possible. Each has a unique set of facsimiles of correspondence and ancillary documents in order to transcribe, edit, annotate, and publish the papers of each of these great men. There are no comparable compilations anywhere else in the world. The projects have collected all of the outgoing and incoming correspondence for each of the Founding Fathers, and the project editors continue to add to their collection of document copies as new letters and documents come to light.

In addition, they have developed trusted methods for making these documents available to the public in printed volumes. Each project has created consistent methods for conveying the exact words of these individuals and indexing them so that others can access them easily. The experienced staff has worked with some of the most prominent academic presses in the country (p. 52, query 7). In mid-2009 when the questionnaires were completed, the editors reported that they have published a combined total of 221 scholarly volumes. Together, the projects now issue at least six new volumes each year containing nearly 3,800 documents processed (see table p. 27). On top of this scholarly output, they are all working with publishers, and independently in the case of the Adams and Franklin Papers, to put the print volumes online in a digital format (p. 50, queries 31 and 32).

Each project focuses on a unique individual. In this sense, each project is like an independent research center with collections and challenges that are unique to it. For example, the Founding Fathers had a variety of methods for preserving their experience and thoughts: Thomas Jefferson used the polygraph and copying press (early copying machines), while John Adams and George Washington kept diaries. Moreover, they each served their country in a variety of positions ranging from administrative jobs to commanders in the field. Adams, Jefferson, and Franklin all lived abroad and were diplomats but Madison rarely traveled. George Washington was a general and commander in chief of our armed forces. Editors thus need expertise in a wide range of topics such as diplomatic and military history, politics, geography, agriculture, finances, and science, to name a few. The very basic job of transcription requires training in orthography. Understanding a word may mean simply acquiring a digital copy and magnifying it in more detail; or it may necessitate an understanding of an archaic vocabulary that includes abbreviations or specialized words that have simply dropped out of our language.

Directly and indirectly, many Americans have benefited from the material collected and analyzed in these specialized research centers. These materials have given rise to scholarly monographs

and popular histories including such best sellers as David McCullough's *John Adams*, Walter Isaacson's *Benjamin Franklin: an American Life*, Joseph Ellis' *Founding Brothers*, and Annette Gordon-Reed's *The Hemingses of Monticello*. Teachers use these documents in grade schools, high schools, and colleges. Parents and educators encourage children to read about the Founding Fathers in children's books made possible by the projects (p. 57, query 47). Materials are integrated into television documentaries and traveling exhibitions. Editors teach professors in National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) workshops and other forums. Scholars write scholarly monographs. In sum, the Founding Fathers projects reach a broad spectrum of Americans. With the delivery of the Founding Fathers in digital editions on the Internet, they will connect with an even larger audience.

Print publication status

Throughout the past half-century, the projects have focused on production of paper volumes (often called the letterpress edition). This focus led to well-established workflows. Documents Compass composed the table below to provide a comparison of the projects and the status of their print publication. The average age of the Founding Fathers projects is 54 years; they are not quite two-thirds of the way toward reaching their goal of an estimated number of 344 volumes.² The earliest project predicted to be completed will be the Papers of Benjamin Franklin in 2021; the last will be the Papers of John Adams in 2043. The table shows variation in both numbers of volumes published, rate of publication, and number of volumes planned for future publication.³

Completed Publications	Adams	Franklin	Jefferson	Jefferson-Retirement	Madison	Washington	total
Volumes printed	42 ⁴	39	41 ⁵	6	32 ⁶	61 ⁷	221
Average pages per vol.	604	790	828	776	735	765	
Avg. docs. processed per vol.	385	596	644	563	612	624	

Based on their current methods, the projects have each predicted how much more they have to do and how long it will take to publish the remaining 123 volumes.

Print Publication Plans	Adams	Franklin	Jefferson	Jefferson-Retirement	Madison	Washington	Total
Additional volumes planned	34	8	17	17	19	28	123
Publication frequency	12 mos./vol	24 mos./vol	12 mos./vol	12 mos./vol	12 mos./vol	6 mos./vol	
No. of docs to be completed	12,900	5,300	10,220	9,204	11,400	19,600	68,624
Anticipated date of completion	2043	2021	2026	2027	2028	2023	

² This average omits the 12 years that the Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series has been in existence, counting that project as part of its parent project, the Papers of Thomas Jefferson at Princeton.

³ The findings here do not vary greatly from the 2008 National Archives report although figures from that report show that the Franklin Papers projected completion in 8 years (2016). This is not likely to happen at the current rate of production, due to staffing problems. See Appendix D, p. 47 of *The Founders Online: Open Access to the Papers of America's Founding Era*, at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/publications/founders-report.pdf>

⁴ This total includes volumes from four series.

⁵ This total includes 5 volumes from Second Series, also referred to as the "Topical Series."

⁶ This total includes volumes from four series.

⁷ This total includes volumes from five series.

The introduction of online publication in which all of these projects are now engaged means that these schedules may change. Just as when research labs make use of new technologies to do scientific research, the introduction of new methods of publishing require these research centers and their publishers to adjust and reassess their methods, skill requirements, and equipment.

Scholarly process

This section outlines the primary stages undertaken by each project to move documents from the manuscript stage (copies of original documents) to fully annotated transcriptions of original documents that are ready for publication.

Collection of Documents (see p. 30 for Questionnaire responses)

Documents Compass posed a series of questions to determine the nature of each project's collection and ascertain where they were in terms of the remaining unpublished documents.

Each of the projects was established with the objective of collecting all of the outgoing and incoming correspondence for each of the Founding Fathers. At their start, the projects conducted extensive searches by mail, canvassing archives in the United States and foreign repositories. In the case of Thomas Jefferson, for example, the project editors have collected 70,000 documents from over 900 different repositories and individuals.⁸

It is clear that the projects have mostly completed the identification and collection of documents to be included in their publications. The exception is a small group of documents (500-1,500 items) identified by the Adams Papers that have not yet been obtained, mostly from the Library of Congress or the National Archives. Project editors continue to locate new documents, but the number obtained per year in this way is small. All new material is immediately obtained as a digital facsimile or photocopy, which the projects then accessioned and transcribed. Documents Compass concluded that the amount of staff time devoted to the acquisition of new material is negligible (p. 30, query 15).

Most of the projects have recently benefitted from the fact that much of the manuscript material has been scanned to produce digital images. The American Memory project at the Library of Congress has made digital copies of documents available for Jefferson, Madison, and Washington. Projects can link these images to their project databases (the most convenient mode of use), or find them on the Library of Congress website. The Adams Papers project has scanned a significant body of material, but uses the original manuscript holdings in its editorial process. The Jefferson Papers: Retirement Series obtained color digital scans from the largest repositories that hold the original documents they plan to publish (p. 48, query 25).

The availability of digital facsimiles has been enormously helpful to the projects, when originals are not available. Editors can view the original document more quickly using the digital facsimile, saving the time it takes to physically retrieve a document from the folder, view it, and refile it. Given the number of times project staff members need to consult the original document during

⁸ Barbara Oberg, "Letters by Founding Fathers," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 17 January 2008. Video interview accessed on 1-30-10 <http://www.philly.com/inquirer/multimedia/13866856.html>

the editorial process, the availability of a digital facsimile saves time for everyone. Editors can also study a document in new ways using a digital facsimile on a computer. They can magnify small or cramped handwriting; they can increase the darkness of the ink in faintly scribbled notes; and they can rotate (or flip) an image to see text showing through the back of a document.⁹ The quality of digital images, however, varies widely. The digital images available on the American Memory website, for example, were made from microfilm, not the original documents. They can be difficult, and sometimes impossible to read. On the other hand, archives with the latest scanners or digital cameras can produce high-resolution color scans of documents that are almost as good as viewing the original manuscript.

The use of digital facsimiles has not eliminated the need for editors to consult the original manuscripts in repositories. The original documents are of vital importance for their evidentiary value. The location of a document in a given repository provides clues that help editors establish its origins and authenticity. They often have to view the original document in its entirety to decipher its meaning, to understand its composition, or to confirm the identity of the handwriting. It is only by looking at the original manuscript in the archive after numerous reviews have been made against the facsimile in the office, that the editors can resolve some of the most complex questions about a document, particularly questions of transcription.

Transcription of Documents

Transcribing the documents is the primary task for all documentary editions and no less so for the projects. No work can begin until handwritten documents have been keyboarded in a systematic way. As stated in the *Guide to Documentary Editing*, this first transcription is the “initial conversion of the document’s contents to a rough but accurate transcription that will become editorial working copy.”¹⁰ The first attempt at transcription will be called, for the purposes of this report, a “rough” transcription. It is considered rough for a variety of reasons.

In the case of the Founders projects all of the original documents are comprised of 18th and 19th century handwriting that can be difficult to read. The presence of proper names, abbreviations and symbols, and archaic words in a document can pose problems for even experienced transcribers. Manuscripts are frequently damaged with holes in the middle of words or edges that have disintegrated with age or have been attacked by vermin. As a result, the transcriber will represent many of these textual issues with gaps, ellipses, or question marks in the rough transcription. It is also not unusual for a transcriber to drop lines or an entire paragraph because he/she loses their place in the manuscript. A transcriber will sometimes transcribe the copy first accessioned by the project, or one of multiple versions not selected by the editor for publication after closer inspection. If a more authoritative copy is later acquired, or an alternate version decided on, the transcription will need to be adjusted.

For the projects, a variety of staff members typically accomplishes the work of initial transcription. The positions of these staff members range from digital technicians (Jefferson: Retirement Series workflow, p. 42) to editorial assistants (Jefferson Papers workflow, p. 40) to senior editors

⁹ Traditionally, this would have required an editor to stand with the document in front of a mirror in order to reverse the direction of the text.

¹⁰ Mary-Jo Kline and Susan H. Perdue, *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 3d revised ed. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 112.

(Madison Papers workflow, p. 44). Some projects (Adams Papers) use graduate students to handle the initial transcription, while some have used keyboarding vendors for large-scale transcription to save time and money. No matter who composes the rough transcription and no matter their level of expertise, all documents in this category are considered to be at the starting point of the editorial process. Editors have to verify them and make them into a transcription fit to publish. For example, the Jefferson Papers prepare a first verification in advance of the assigned editor beginning the annotation work, and when that first verification is done, a draft descriptive note is also prepared (p. 47, query 21). But, mostly, rough transcripts are unimproved from the point of their creation until the editing process begins. This can be a significant period of time. The projects have nearly completed rough transcriptions of all of the material that is designated for publication: a combined total of approximately 68,600 documents (p. 31, query 16A).

In the sense that the rough transcript is considered just the first step in the editing process, a document can be described as evolving from a rough state to one that is fully edited.¹¹ The rough transcript will undergo significant revision and correction during that process. All of the issues that the transcriptionist encountered in making the rough transcript, such as holes in the text and the spelling of a last name, will have to be resolved in the end by the editors. The editors may provide conjectural text for the letters or words that were destroyed over time. The editors may have to do some research in other sources to determine the identity of the person whose last name stumped the transcriber. These and many other questions that the editors encounter will necessitate numerous passes over a single document transcription. It is also during this phase that they begin the work of providing the necessary historical context for the document through annotation.

Annotation of Documents

The ultimate value for others of historical editing is the presentation of a fully edited text along with the historical context that helps readers understand the document fully. Historical documents are dense with references that are obscure or only understood in relationship to other documents. The Founding Fathers Project editors are scholars of the founding period and their breadth of experience with the material is brought to bear on the documents during the annotation process. The projects do not share a uniform approach to the structure or depth of annotation; nevertheless all of the projects provide the following:

- 1 . Document type: there are many document types ranging from a letter written by the sender and signed by that person, to copies made of letters and retained by the sender in letterbooks, or made by a third-party. Drafts, for instance, add several layers of textual complexity. Ascertaining all of the document types for a given document can be a complex process requiring editorial and historical expertise. All of the projects account for every known contemporary version of a document. This knowledge allows the project staff to trace the history of a letter and its meaning in the context of its time.
- 2 . Document source: a note appended to the document describing the institution that owns the documents, usually presented in the form of a standardized abbreviation.

¹¹ See a sample document that represents this evolution in Appendix B, p. 34, of *The Founders Online: Open Access to the Papers of America's Founding Era*, at <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/publications/founders-report.pdf>.

- 3 . Textual information: this information is usually provided in the form of numbered footnotes and is intended to describe features such as text inserted between the lines, words apparently misspelled, deleted text that might be of interest, or identifying different hands (handwriting from two different people). This device is also used to account for variations between different versions of a text; the difference, for example, between the letter that was sent and the copy that was retained.
- 4 . Missing documents: the projects all account for documents known to have existed from references in the documents they do have or from other sources such as auction catalogs. Missing documents (also called letters not found) are accounted for in a variety of ways. Some projects incorporate them into the annotation, some projects put a place holder for them where they would have occurred in the chronology, and some list them in an appendix.
- 5 . Contextual information: The editions vary greatly in terms of how they present contextual annotation and the amount of information they provide. Biographical statements that describe a person's life in relation to the subject of the edition are the most common annotational device. But there are many more. Annotations may clarify a reference to an event, define an archaic term, give the source for a literary quote, explain a reference to a newspaper article, or identify a place or ship name. A simple annotation may even alter the entire meaning of a document by exploring handwriting, covers (envelopes), and watermarks. The back-of-the-book index and notes accompanying the document are also tools to help readers identify people, places, and historical events referred to in the documents. By doing this research editors will establish whether or not a Founding Father wrote an essay, pamphlet, or even a letter, that has long been attributed to his pen. These sorts of discoveries transform our understanding of an event and can change our interpretation of history.
- 6 . Editorial notes: a note or essay that sheds light on an important document or group of documents.
- 7 . Editorial apparatus: all of the projects provide a statement about their transcription methods, abbreviations in use, and other devices used in the annotation such as short titles. They also include a preface or introduction that highlights important events represented in the volume, and that calls the reader's attention to interesting and significant documents. Some projects include editorial commentary within the appendices to explain their treatment of letters not printed in full or financial documents.

Using the project research collections

In composing annotation for the volumes, editors rely on the larger documentary record that they hold in their project collections. The projects have collected many more copies of documents than will ultimately be included in the published volumes. Some of this material finds its way into the annotation. For example, they collect family and spousal correspondence, enclosures, legal documents, newspaper items, pamphlets, invitations, drawings, accounts, land warrants, ships papers, and passports. In preparation for their scholarly work, the support documents often receive the same attention that is accorded the published documents. The editors do not publish all of the documents to and from the main subject of the edition. The time consuming process of selecting documents to omit includes a review of the entire corpus and full transcriptions of all the

documents under consideration. Documents may be omitted based on their routine or repetitive nature. All of the projects have a method to account for this material.

The projects also have to contend with a large volume of undated material that they hold in their research collections. This material has to be reviewed on a regular basis, and the editors attempt to date it based on their knowledge of the larger archive. Once they determine a date, no matter how speculative, it has to be incorporated into the volumes based on its date.

It is useful for the projects to have accurate and searchable transcripts of all of the documents in the archive, especially as described in this section. That is because the editors are thus enabled to search through this body of material and retrieve relevant documents. In the end, every known document to and from the project's founding father is accounted for in some way within the edition. This is the defining feature of a comprehensive scholarly edition.

Project workflow (see p. 33 - 47 for *Questionnaire responses*)

Documents Compass sought to identify the workflow process of each edition. Because different editors established each set of papers at different institutions, for different presses, and at different times, they all created their own patterns. The most significant difference among the projects is the distribution of work among the editors. Believing that these work patterns have an impact on the cost and efficiency of projects, Documents Compass explored them. During this process, many project editors provided their own documented workflow descriptions; others were gathered during on-site visits.

The process of bringing a document from its manuscript form to one that is fully annotated and ready for publication is somewhat similar across the projects, however, the distribution of labor among staff members and the role each staff member plays in accomplishing that goal vary widely. We note below some of the areas where workflow is most variable. These range from staffing to administrative issues, some of which are outside of the project's control:

1. *Staff variations.* Only three of the projects have staff devoted to digital tasks (Jefferson: Retirement, Washington, and Adams). One consequence is that as a project considers adopting new technologies, it may not have the necessary expertise to plan for or support such a transition (p. 56, query 43). Another example of staff variation is the employment and use of copy editors. The projects employ copy editors to review the scholarly materials the editors have written that explain the letters: annotations, editorial essays, volume prefaces, and so on. Neither of the Jefferson projects employs a person designated as a copy editor. The Madison and Washington projects have staff copy editors, while the Adams Papers project outsources its copy editing work. In addition to their own copy editing work, some of the projects submit material to their publishers for another round of copy editing (Washington) and design/page layout work (both Jefferson projects), while in other cases the press receives a project's content nearly ready for typesetting (Adams). One consequence of this is the varied amount of staff time directly consumed by these tasks.

2. *Division of editorial labor.* The division of editorial labor exerts some impact on workflow and therefore productivity. Some of the publications are divided into series; others are not. The

publication of separate series within a given project allows it to deploy editors to take sole charge of a single series, and to publish on an alternating schedule. This approach means that as a series volume is ready for publication it is put in a queue behind a volume from a different series, waiting for final review by the copy editor, Editor-in-Chief, and press. Solo editorial models include Madison (1 editor each for secretary of state, presidential, and retirement series); and Washington (revolutionary and presidential series). The Adams Papers is divided into series but follows a team approach as described below. In 1998, the Jefferson Papers project, in collaboration with the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, determined that the project could be concluded more quickly if it was separated into two chronological series. The result was the establishment of the Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series, which is treated as a separate project for the purpose of this report.

Other projects use teams of editors who work together on all volumes. In these cases, the editors work collectively on each volume distributing the work according to expertise, often based on the Editor-in-Chief's distribution of the work. Team editors include Adams, Jefferson, and Franklin. Jefferson: Retirement uses the team model with two teams of two working on every other volume. The distribution of the work is either chronological or topical, based on the team's preference.

Whatever editorial model is adopted by the project and size of the staff, nearly all of the project staff becomes involved with the production of a volume as it nears the point of going to press and through revisions. Editors review the manuscript for stylistic consistency. They proofread the final pages and contribute to the index. In the end, every volume becomes a collaborative process.

3. *Staff stability.* At the time of this report, all the projects except Franklin state that they enjoy relatively stable staffing enabling them to meet their publication deadlines. All, however, cite staff fluctuations as the single most important obstacle to meeting deadlines. If a staff change occurs anywhere in the structure—from the departure of a fact checker to that of a senior editor—the process is disrupted. The interdependencies that are inherent in these workflows, as evidenced in the statements included here, and the cyclical nature of the production, requires a 100% staffing model in order to be achievable (p. 53, query 12). If any element is missing, the schedule is adversely affected. Given that the staff size of these projects is, on average, between 7 and 8 (p. 56, query 43) obtaining a steady staff for at least a year can be a challenge, much less for two years, the typical volume cycle. All of the estimates that the editors provide for completion dates of the Founding Fathers volumes assume a continuation of the 100% staffing model, which they know is unlikely (see table p. 27). When a vacancy does occur, positions may remain unfilled for long periods. The editors' survey responses indicate that additional funding and more sophisticated technology do not overcome the problems presented by personnel changes. Training new staff takes time away from all staff members. It is all done on the job, and it often requires the time of the Editors-in-Chief who review and assess all of the work generated by new project editors.

4. *Funding.* The projects rely on multiple sources of funding which are on varying fiscal calendars (p. 55, query 41). The Editors-in-Chief therefore devote some time to grant application writing as well as updates and reports to their funders. The staff time required to produce grant applications is time taken out of the volume production schedule. This can be an issue for all of the projects that are balancing as many as three to six volumes at a time (p. 53, query 11).

5. *Press schedules.* Another factor contributing to production delays is the schedule of the presses. For the most part, the presses can work as planned with the predictable and timely delivery of volume manuscripts, but unexpected shifts in their production schedules can throw the plans of the editorial projects off.

Workflow and production

As already noted, the projects vary in workflow and production rates. The volumes vary in the workflow stages leading to their completion. They also differ in the amount of editorial apparatus and scholarly content. The table on the following page shows a comparison of workflow methodology and of editorial output. This examination is intended to provide a comparative look at similar tasks and their execution across the projects.

The relative size of each project's staff and the distribution of labor therein have an impact on the project workflow (p. 56, query 43). The projects currently report that they are generally able to meet their deadlines and are even exceeding them despite some staff and technical changes in the last ten years, as well as the added demand of digital publication (pp. 53 - 54, queries 12 and 13).

The projects also do not share a common vocabulary to describe the steps taken along the way. This is most common for those stages leading up to annotation work — those that have to do with finalizing the text. Not all of the projects, for example, engage in tandem oral proofreading of text, and when they do, they do not necessarily call it this. The lack of a consistent vocabulary across the projects becomes problematic during discussions with the editors about workflow because they do not apply the terminology in the same way.¹² For this reason, a glossary follows the table on the next page.

¹² This issue is not confined to the Founding Fathers projects but characterizes the profession of historical documentary editing as a whole. There is no standardized terminology or agreed upon benchmarks in historical editions as there are, for example, in literary editions, which follow the guidelines of the Council for Scholarly Editions (Modern Language Association) in order to become "an approved text." The guidelines are found at <http://www.mla.org/cse_guidelines>

*Workflow and production table*¹³

Workflow	Adams	Franklin	Jefferson	Jefferson Ret	Madison	Washington
Oral proofreading	2 oral proofs	1 oral proof	No oral proof	1 oral proof	1 oral proof	No oral proof
Verification	0	1	2 ¹⁴	2	1	1
Editorial apparatus: introduction	43 pages	63 pages	47 pages	46 pages	38 pages	34 pages
index	57 pages	72 pages	59 pages	54 pages	60 pages	61 pages
Number of volumes in progress	3 volumes	4 volumes	3 volumes	3 volumes	3 volumes	6 volumes
Distribution of annotation	Shared-divided by editors	Shared-assigned by ed in chief	Assigned by ed in chief in consultation w/ sr. assoc. eds.	Shared-divided by editors	Solo editors	Solo editors
Volume illustrations and permissions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Series	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Workflow tracking	Annotation worksheet	Tracking chart	Binders and CMS with workflow module	CMS with workflow module	Document cover sheets	Not Available
Control files	Digitizing	Digitized	Digitized	Digitized	Paper	Digitized
Typesetting and or camera ready copy	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Markup or formatting	Editors	Administrative assistant	Eds/ editorial Assistant	Editors/digital technicians	Copy editor	Not available ¹⁵
Page proofs character per character proofread	Yes	Not available ¹⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes ¹⁷
Outsourcing production	Free lance copy editing and translation	Not available	Translation/transcription review of foreign lang.	Translation/transcription review of foreign lang.	Not available	Proofreading of manuscript

Glossary of the terms used in the table:

Oral proofreading: two individuals work as a team, one holds and reads from the manuscript version of the document (this could be a photocopy, digital facsimile, or the original manuscript), the second listens and marks corrections on paper in the transcription. This is called collation at the Adams Papers.

¹³ All of the data provided in the table comes from the workflow statements, responses to questionnaires (as noted), the project volumes, and the production tables on p. 27 - 29. When the information available is insufficient to provide a definitive value in the table, Not available is used.

¹⁴ The Editor-in-Chief's review also includes a third verification.

¹⁵ The Washington Papers workflow does not mention this process but it is possible that this work is done by the copy editor.

¹⁶ The Franklin Papers workflow states that the page proofs are "reviewed" but it is not clear whether that entails a character-per-character reading of the pages against corrected copy.

¹⁷ The Washington Papers workflow states that this process occurs off-site and with the use of a tape recorder.

Verification: one individual does a character-per-character check of the document transcription against a manuscript version of the document (this could be a photocopy, digital facsimile, or the original manuscript). Projects sometimes use this term for the fact-checking process.

Editorial Apparatus: all projects produce volume front matter that includes a table of contents; foreword, preface, or introduction; chronology; statement of editorial style; list of repository abbreviations; short titles; and illustration captions, where applicable. This material is included in both print and digital formats.

Index: all projects compose their indexes in-house. Indexing density (the number of entries per volume) varies across the projects (see production table on p. 29).

Numbers of volumes in progress: the number of volumes that are being worked on at a project at a given moment in time across the entire staff (see p. 53, query 11).

Distribution of annotation: There are two basic models for the editorial work: one in which the work is shared by more than one editor and a second in which the work is performed by a single editor. The method for distributing the annotation varies by project as noted.

Volume illustrations and permissions: projects that include illustrations make their own selections of what illustrations to include, and they obtain permissions, compose captions and illustrations lists for the front matter. The Adams Papers also determines the location of the illustrations in the volume.

Series: projects that maintain separate series of volumes. For example, the Madison Papers produces three series: Secretary of State, Presidential, and Retirement.

Workflow tracking: any methods or tools in use by the project to track its work. This is derived from the workflow statement or from the technology in use by the project. There may be other record-keeping or tracking systems that the editors use that they did not mention.

Control files: All of the projects maintain a centralized system of document control that originated as a paper file system. The Adams Papers refers to this as the slip file.

Typesetting and or camera-ready copy: projects that set page breaks and line-endings, formatting of all text, and placement of illustrations, among other tasks to provide camera-ready copy to the press.

Markup or formatting: project personnel responsible for inputting tags, formatting codes, and special characters for the compositor.

Page proofs character-per-character proofread: two individuals work as a team, one holds and reads from the copy text and the second follows along in the page proofs. The entire volume is read word-for-word including all front matter. Corrections made to page proofs are returned to the press. This process is repeated until no more errors are discovered.

Outsourcing production: any stage of the process described by the projects where work is not performed by the staff.

Online access

With the advent of the Internet, the desire for electronic access to the Founding Fathers material has led to a variety of digital initiatives. This section provides a brief overview of those efforts and looks at the steps already taken by the projects toward digital publication. All of the projects are in the process of, or have made progress toward, providing online access to their documents (see p. 50, queries 31 and 32).

At David W. Packard's initiative more than twenty years ago, the Packard Humanities Institute set out to produce a widely accessible digital archive of the papers of all the Founding Fathers. He began with the Washington Papers, under the leadership of W.W. Abbot, and the Franklin Papers. Within a few years Packard began to concentrate on the Franklin Papers, which had a more manageable number of documents. Conceived as a CD-ROM edition, the technology current at the time, Packard envisioned the Founding Fathers Papers would be made freely available. It also believed that digitizing the archive would assist the Founding Fathers editors with their work. The project was reconceived as a website as CD-ROMs were superseded by web delivery and on 17 January 2006, Franklin's 300th birthday, Packard launched a website of all the published and unpublished Franklin Papers, free of charge to the public: <http://www.franklinpapers.org/franklin/digital.jsp>.

It is only over the past half decade, however, that online access to the projects has burgeoned with the establishment of the Electronic Imprint of the University of Virginia Press. Begun in 2001 with funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the University of Virginia President's Office, the Electronic Imprint released its first digital publication, the *Dolley Madison Digital Edition*, in 2004. (The *Dolley Madison Digital Edition* is a born-digital edition.) The same year the Press established Rotunda as its central site for electronic imprints. Rotunda's stated mission is "the publication of original digital scholarship along with newly digitized critical and documentary editions in the humanities and social sciences."¹⁸

Rotunda started the process of planning for online publication with the *Papers of George Washington* in the fall of 2004. The Rotunda staff began work on converting 52 letterpress volumes (over 30,000 print pages) in 2005, and released the publication in 2007. In 2009, Rotunda released an electronic version of 33 letterpress volumes of the *Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (all of the volumes published through 2006). By 2009 it had become clear that the papers of the Founding Fathers would all become accessible in an online version.

Rotunda outsourced most of the conversion work on the Washington volumes to an independent vendor, who converted the volumes into the appropriate electronic format. The Press abandoned that system, however, after seeing how much additional work it would still have to do on the texts due to the vendors' high error rate, a rate that Rotunda concluded was not likely to diminish. Rotunda therefore revised its own workflow, taking on more of the work in-house for all subsequent letterpress volumes beginning with the *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*.¹⁹ Nonetheless, the process of converting print volumes to digital format via double keyboarding has continued to require significant review by the editorial projects.

¹⁸ From the Rotunda website, accessed on 1-21-10 <http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/index.php?page_id=About>

¹⁹ See John Carlson, Mary Ann Lugo, and David Sewell, "Outsourcing Complex Digitization: Lessons Learned," a poster presentation from 2007 TEI Members' Meeting <http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/index.php?page_id=research>

In cooperation with Harvard University Press and the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Adams Papers began to digitize its contents in 2005. The papers launched the Founding Families: Digital Editions, Papers of the Winthrops and the Adamses <<http://www.masshist.org/ff/>>. The aim was to convert all of the Adams Papers volumes in print through the year 2006 to a digital format (30 volumes from three series). The Massachusetts Historical Society offers free access to the online Adams Papers, and is committed to adding new volumes and other related material. The staff of the Adams Papers and the Massachusetts Historical Society oversaw many of the tasks in the process that Rotunda had taken on for Washington and Jefferson, although Rotunda provided technical assistance. Subsequently Rotunda formed an agreement with the Adams Papers to publish 30 Adams volumes alongside the Washington and Jefferson volumes <<http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/default.xqy?keys=ADMS-print-00-00-02-0001>>.²⁰

By 2007 Rotunda had recognized the scholarly and educational benefits of combining the projects into a consolidated search platform, and began building the necessary technical infrastructure, completing the work eighteen months later — in November 2008. Currently the Founding Era Platform material is available for purchase on a sliding-scale fee. The editions can now be acquired separately or together as a single unit. All of the Rotunda material now available by subscription was converted from letterpress volumes, and the projects and their publishers have an agreement with Rotunda that each new volume will be added to the digital content 18-24 months after it appears in print.

Rotunda will release 31 volumes of the *Papers of James Madison* and 4 volumes of the *Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series* in 2010. Conversations with the Franklin Papers project are underway. Once Rotunda publishes Madison and Jefferson: Retirement, subscribers will have access to 156 fully annotated volumes on the American Founding Era Platform (see p. 50, query 33). But this venture will still leave a combined total of almost 70,000 documents from the projects that have not yet been published, waiting to be published in both print and digital format.

The NHRPC-funded pilot project, “Transcribing the Founder’s Papers for Online Access,” tested a model for public access to the unpublished documents of Founding Fathers Papers projects. Rotunda has put online over 5,000 Madison and Adams documents free of charge on its Early Access site < <http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/FOEA.html> >. The site allows users to search simultaneously through all of the published and unpublished Founding Fathers Projects’ material, although access to full documents is restricted to the Early Access documents, and those which the user has subscribed to. Some of the techniques and processes developed over the one-year pilot are described in the following section.

Technology and digital publication (see pp. 46 - 51 Questionnaire responses)

All of the participants involved in the process to date see this point in time as a transitional moment. They recognize that the current model that converts printed text to XML is not efficient for publishers or editors. All of the materials now on line resulted from the conversion of print volumes.²¹ The editors in particular are concerned about the potential for introducing errors to

²⁰ “About the American Founding Era Platform,” <<http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/default.xqy?keys=FGEA-info-remote&ref=file-fgea>>

²¹ Most of the technical work was done by Rotunda. The exception is the 30 Adams volumes where additional funding enabled non-editorial staff to take on the work of digitization.

content during the conversion process, content that they have painstakingly produced for the print volumes. They are therefore investigating digital publication models that will allow them greater control of the digital and print output. This means that in the future all material for online publication will be derived from electronic files rather than conversion from print volumes. The projects already employ a variety of software and digital tools in order to create electronic files for publication.

We outline below the three models that describe the methods now in use by the projects to generate electronic files that will produce both print and digital editions.

1. Word processing system: In this model, word processing files will be converted to XML or other digital format outside of the project by the publisher or other vendor after the files have been prepared for print publication by the project.²² The projects that follow the word processing model at the time of this report are the Papers of Benjamin Franklin and the Papers of James Madison. Currently, Yale University Press gives PDF files to the Packard Humanities Institute for conversion.
2. Adopting an XML system: projects working in a traditional word processing system but at the same time incorporating or developing an XML process for dual digital publication. None of the projects in this category have as yet published digitally from XML files, but they will do so in future. The projects that follow this model at the time of this report are the Papers of John Adams, Papers of Thomas Jefferson and the Papers of George Washington.
3. XML system: projects that have fully implemented an XML-based system and are publishing in print and digital format from that system. The project that follows this model is the Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series. Print volumes have been published in this manner since 2004 and digital publication is scheduled for 2010.

The importance of XML

XML stands for Extensible Markup Language. It is a free and open standards language that is used in humanities computing and business applications. XML has been widely adopted because it is a flexible computer language that makes powerful searching possible. For example, the way in which a date is tagged in XML will make it easier for a user to find three different letters written on the same date but referred to in three different ways such as:

January 9th, 1803
9 Jan. '03
Jany 9. '3.

In all three cases, the use of an XML tag with a standardized date of 1803-01-09 will enable the user to retrieve all three documents with one search `<date>1803-01-09</date>`

For the editors, XML documents can be used for both print and electronic publication. In other

²²All digitizing undertaken for online publication was done by outside sources but in consultation with the projects. Rotunda digitized all of the 143 volumes now on the consolidated Founding Era Platform. It converted the print volumes to XML and it determined the encoding specifications, tagging, and navigation. Similarly, the Packard Humanities Foundation digitized the Papers of Benjamin Franklin. See David Sewell, "It's for Sale, So it Must Be Finished: Digital Projects in the Scholarly Publishing World." *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2 (Spring 2009).

words, a document can be ushered through the editorial process one time—transcribed, verified, annotated, fact checked, copy edited—and then sent off for both print and digital publication.²³ It is for this reason that projects have adopted, or are adopting, this kind of technology. It is important to note that the editors were not asked directly about the cost of adopting an XML-based system. It is assumed that there are numerous underlying costs that are borne by the projects, and that these are represented in the following sections that outline the adjustments required to be made by a project that adopts this new technology.

Modifying workflow

As noted in the workflow section above, each project has a well-established workflow that depends on a 100% staffing model and assumes that the project meets its deadlines for publication each year. If a project decides to make the transition from a word-processing system to an XML-based system, it has to adjust the project workflow. A project can decide to make the transition gradually with one editor at a time working in the new system or all at once. In either case, the project must build additional time into the production process to enable one member, or the entire staff to do the following:

1. become familiar with the XML computer language
2. use a new software program, generally an XML editor
3. use a new content management system or file storage system
4. make corrections and add content in a new way
5. fix problems arising from the conversion of word processed documents and formatting codes
6. provide documentation for the staff and update project manuals and/or style guides

This list of workflow modifications that come about as a project shifts from a word-processing system to an XML-based system is derived, in part, from the experience Documents Compass had with the pilot project in 2009. The pilot project was tasked with taking a group of 5,000 documents prepared in a word processing system and getting them ready for digital publication. Documents Compass did this work with an XML-based system. Most of the pilot project staff members had never worked with an XML system before and all had to be trained in its use. The work of the pilot project, therefore, approximated the process an editorial project might go through in making the same shift and thus informs the above list. The key difference here is that Documents Compass did not have to prepare documents for print publication, as the projects do.

Content management systems

The predominant tool in use by projects for implementing an XML-based system is a content management system (CMS). A CMS is a computer-based system used to manage workflow in a collaborative environment that allows the editors to contribute and share files. Two of the projects have adopted such a system and are transitioning their staff and workflow to its use fulltime (The Papers of Thomas Jefferson and the Papers of George Washington). The Papers of Thomas

²³ XML uses style sheets and a transformation language called XSL (Extensible Stylesheet Language) that changes the appearance of certain features within a document for different media. For example, something tagged in a document as a or delete, might appear as crossed-through text in red in the online digital version. The same feature would be entirely dropped out for the print edition. These two different results are accomplished through style sheets.

Jefferson: Retirement Series has such a system in place that it has been using for more than five years (p. 48, query 24).

The CMS employed by these projects is a web-based document storage system that is used by the editors on a daily basis. Documents are stored in the system and checked out as needed by the editors, either one at a time, or in batches. Editors save the working copy of the document they are editing on their desktop while they make corrections and compose annotation in the XML-editing software. Once the editor is finished, he/she uploads the altered document back to the CMS. The changes are updated and the document displays in the CMS with all of the revisions. If an editor wishes to undo the changes or return to an earlier version, he/she can do so by restoring the document to any of the earlier stages. All revisions made to the document are saved. Because it is web-based, an editor can access his/her documents from any computer with an Internet connection. Editors can edit those documents if they have been given permission to do so by a member of the staff who administers the CMS and its users.

Documents Compass used the same CMS as is employed by three of the projects described in this report.²⁴ During the pilot project, Documents Compass utilized the workflow features of the CMS to assign work to staff off site, batch documents as they were ready for digital publication, and track documents that required certain tasks performed.²⁵

Data Conversion

Once a project decides to move to an XML system, the single most important technical issue is converting existing documents (also known as legacy data) to XML. All of the projects have composed document transcriptions in some kind of word processing system (p. 46, queries 19 and 20). All of these documents need to be converted to XML. In the case of the Washington Papers, for example, 19,600 documents yet to be published had to be converted from Word to XML (see table p. 27).

Documents Compass found that based on its experience with the pilot project, the conversion of over 5,000 documents from word processing files to XML files necessitated computer programming assistance. Because the pilot worked with documents from two different projects, two different programming solutions had to be developed. This is because the two projects did not transcribe their documents in the same way or use the same formatting codes. However, once the programming was completed for both projects and it proved satisfactory, that same programming script could be applied to all subsequent documents from those two projects. The programming for conversion needed to be done only once. This is true whether 10 or 10,000 documents are converted. Documents Compass also found that the automated conversion of documents, although it does not successfully convert everything equally well to XML, tends to result in consistent and predictable errors. As a result, they are easier for staff to find them and fix them.²⁶

²⁴ The CMS is PubMan, a product of Dataformat < <http://www.dataformat.com/>>. Dataformat hosts all of the documents that were in the Documents Compass pilot project.

²⁵ All of the documents published as a result of the pilot project and now on Early Access < <http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/FOEA.html>> were downloaded in batches from the CMS as XML files and sent as email attachments to Rotunda. No additional work was needed from Documents Compass to publish them digitally.

²⁶ An example of this kind of error is the tab formatting that transcribers add to document transcriptions in order to move the signature to the right-hand side of the page. Tabs do not have an XML equivalent.

Encoding guidelines

Because XML is a highly-structured language with guidelines on how a document is constructed, projects have to adhere to a document-formatting standard, a reality that is not true of a word processing environment. If a project decides to adopt an XML-based system, it has to make a series of decisions regarding the structure of each document and what XML tags will be used within that structure. These encoding guidelines are derived from the transcription guidelines that are used by the projects for their print publication, but they are not exactly the same. Project editors have to decide how they will represent document features for both the digital and print environments, as noted above.

Editors make their encoding decisions based on the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), a consortium that develops and maintains the standard for representing humanities text in digital form. The TEI serves to create an industry standard for digital projects that can be shared by individuals, institutions, and documentary editions. Project editors need to have some awareness of TEI when they determine what features they will tag in their documents. They must also make adjustments when the TEI Guidelines are reissued which occurred in November 2007 (the release of P5 standards). The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, for example, now in the process of adopting an XML system, is TEI P5 compliant, but the Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement that adopted a similar XML system over five years ago, is not (it uses TEI P4). In order to be TEI compliant, the latter project will have to move to P5 in the future, a process that will have an impact on project workflow (see p. 49, query 29). All of the material digitized by Rotunda for the projects and now online is TEI compliant, but this was accomplished during the digitizing process and was not carried out by the projects themselves.²⁷

As the projects take on the task of producing volumes in both print and digital formats, as is indicated in models 2 and 3 above, they will be responsible for adhering to the TEI standards. This means editors need to familiarize themselves to some degree with the TEI corpora, a tag set that has grown from 163 tags in its first version (P1, released in 1990), to 504 tags in its most recent version (P5, released in 2007).²⁸ In fact, digital documentary editions are increasingly being asked by funding agencies such as the NEH to adhere to the most recent TEI standards.²⁹

A project has to consider the following factors when adjusting its workflow to adopt an XML-based system:

- 1) determine how a variety of features will appear in two different media: print and digital
- 2) adjust the project documentation and the Document Type Definition (DTD) when the XML tags change

²⁷ David Sewell, "It's for Sale, So it Must Be Finished: Digital Projects in the Scholarly Publishing World." *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2 (Spring 2009), 9.

²⁸ Fotis Jannidis, "TEI in a crystal ball," *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, vol. 24, no. 3 (2009), 258.

²⁹ The Scholarly Editions and Translations division of the National Endowment for the Humanities states the following to applicants: "For electronic publication....Applicants are encouraged to use open standards and markup conforming to the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), and to employ current best practices in creation of electronic editions. Other pertinent considerations include access, interoperability, and persistence of electronic data" <<http://www.neh.gov/grants/guidelines/editions.html>> accessed on 19 January 2010. TEI states that, in addition to NEH, its recommendations are also endorsed by numerous agencies worldwide < <http://www.tei-c.org/About/history.xml>> accessed on 19 January 2010.

- 3) obtain programming assistance to modify the style sheets and DTD
- 4) use of TEI encoding guidelines and their implementation³⁰

Documents Compass found that, based on its experience with the pilot project in which we worked with two different sets of documents from the projects, we had to compose two different sets of encoding guidelines to address the underlying transcription guidelines of the two projects. Documents Compass prepared all of the documents for digital publication according to the standards of TEI P5. We benefitted from the fact that a document-encoding scheme using P5 had already been developed for two of the other projects (the Papers of Thomas Jefferson and Papers of George Washington, see p. 49, query 29). Documents Compass was able to use the same structural encoding scheme with some alterations to address the needs of the two different projects it was working with.³¹ This suggests that the projects can share the expertise in TEI that has already been established and that they do not need to “reinvent the wheel” when it comes to adopting an encoding scheme.

As a part of the pilot project, we were asked to track time and cost. Including the project’s start up expenses, we found that it cost approximately \$38 dollars per document to prepare each of these upgraded transcriptions. The costs included the expense of converting the various files into a standard online format, obtaining copies of originals, proofreading initial transcriptions against original documents, and making necessary corrections to those files. The work was built upon the decades-long in-place efforts that the projects made both to collect the papers and to create initial transcriptions. The costs did not include such important steps as final verification, annotation, indexing, and the scholarly research done by the editors trained in the particulars of each Founder. Since we prepared these documents in a format that was compatible with the Rotunda imprint’s standards, they were submitted to the Press with little adjustment.

Intellectual issues

Access

When a project decides to take on the preparation of texts for digital publication, the editors make a series of decisions related to encoding that have to do with intellectual access to their content. As noted above, all of the projects content now online has been converted from print volumes and as a result, it relies, in part, on the devices used by those print volumes to provide intellectual access, such as the table of contents and back-of-the-book index. Moving forward, the projects will continue to produce the table of contents and index for the print volumes and likewise these features will be part of the online publication, but there are numerous other methods that the editors may apply as part of the encoding scheme in order to increase access and enrich the content. As a project transitions to an XML-based system, the editors have to determine how much of this kind of mark-up they will do, mark-up that is in addition to the editing and annotation they accomplish at present. Project editors have to weigh the added time it takes to do this tagging against the added value this markup introduces to each document. Some examples of this kind of mark-up include:

³⁰ The current version of the TEI Guidelines (P5) was released in November 2007 and is at <<http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/index.html>>.

³¹ This was the basic concept behind the Model Editions Partnership (MEP), a venture funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission in 1996 to establish a subset of TEI tags for use by documentary editions. MEP originated in SGML (Standardized Generalized Markup Language), the precursor to XML. Six documentary editing projects participated in a pilot project employing the MEP guidelines, but it was never translated for use in an XML environment. See <<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july97/07chesnutt.html>>

Hyper-linking: when a correspondent indicates he/she received the sender's letter of the "6th ulto" (the sixth of last month), the editor can connect the two letters together through a hyperlink that enables the users to move back and forth between them electronically. This would also include cross-references in the annotation to other documents that would be accomplished electronically with a hyperlink.

Name regularization: descriptive tagging in the text can distinguish identical terms or provide fuller detail to assist users for retrieval. For example, if the word "Washington" appears in the body of a document, it can be marked-up as a person's name (e.g. "George Washington") or a place name (e.g. "Washington, D.C."), depending on the context. In this example, a user could search on the person George Washington and exclude the false hits for the place name. Another example would be if a writer referred to "the president" in a letter, the mark-up would provide the full name for the reference (e.g. "Thomas Jefferson"), thereby enabling the user to search for references to Jefferson even though he was not named explicitly in the content.

Documents Compass found that based on its experience with the pilot project, only the most basic of mark-up tasks could be accomplished without editorial expertise. The tagging of names, for example, as described above is something that requires familiarity with the content and is best done by an editor. In the case of the pilot project, tagging was added to the source note in order to provide an expanded value for the abbreviation. For example, when a document was said to be from "DLC," Documents Compass tagged that as an abbreviation and provided its expanded value in the document, which is the "Library of Congress."

Interoperability

For the purposes of this report, the concept of interoperability is used to describe the extent to which the projects can be integrated together in a digital environment. This concept has only become possible with the advent of the Internet wherein digital resources can be linked to one another through hyper-linking or searched together in a single portal. The projects could not have anticipated the technological revolution that has been brought about by the Internet nor could they have guessed that they might be expected to consider the ways in which they can make their editions interoperable.³²

The University of Virginia Press's electronic imprint, Rotunda, has published the majority of the Founding Fathers Project material to date. In the process of doing so, it recognized the need for a "Founders platform," or single entry point to search across all of the content. From Rotunda's perspective, this framework would allow it to add publications in the future using the same "single overarching interface." The consolidated platform is designed to help users find what they are looking for in a single place.³³

The primary issue arising from the consolidated platform is the lack of a centralized name authority system in use by the projects. Rotunda has had to create its own name authority list to

³² This is not to say that the Projects do not include numerous cross-references to each other in the annotation, a feature now present only in the print volumes but something that can be hyper-linked in the digital publication.

³³ See "About the American Era Founding Platform" at <<http://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/default.xqy?keys=FGEA-info-remote&ref=file-fgea>>

allow users to search by correspondents within the documents in its online publication. As more volumes are digitized, however, the complexity of the name authority issue will expand as new projects bring in new versions of established names. This is because each project has created its own name authority system for its ongoing work. The projects do not necessarily use the same name for the same individual. A project may use an abbreviated version of a name in the document title (such as “From Lafayette”), a device used by both the Jefferson: Retirement Series and the Madison Papers. Both projects provide the full name in the index, but the Jefferson Papers indexes him as: Lafayette, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, marquis de; while the Madison Papers indexes him as Lafayette, Gilbert du Motier. This is one example of the many inconsistencies in the name authority systems that are almost without exception, tied to the process of creating the back-of-the book index.

The projects prepare a back-of-the-book index for each new volume published. It is generally assumed that each of the projects will prepare a print cumulative index for the entire series at its conclusion. To that end, some have been maintaining an ongoing cumulative index to which they add the contents of each new volume. The cumulative index is therefore a comprehensive taxonomy of the content in all the volumes. It is the established name authority system for their content, and the editors consider it adequate for this purpose (p. 47, query 23). All subjects noted in the letters themselves and in the annotation make their way into the index. When asked about whether the project keeps a glossary of people, places, etc. the editors cite the cumulative index, both paper and electronic. It remains to be seen whether the methods they have devised for keeping their cumulative index will translate to the digital environment or whether those cumulative indexes can be integrated together. It is clear that as more project material is placed on line within a consolidated platform, the issue of name authority will need to be addressed.

Estimated costs / timetables

See the following page for a table that shows costs and timetables for past and current production, as well as projections for estimated completion dates and costs. These figures cover the printed volumes only, and do not include costs or timetables for online access.

There are many variables that affect the information in this chart, including length of documents, depth of indexing, density of page text and extent of annotations. All of the editions have foreign language documents. Not all of the projects publish full translations. The number of foreign language documents printed with full translations affects the production rate and increases costs. There are additional factors such as location of project, rates of pay and benefits, and the difference in the budget-reporting systems. A more detailed look at some of these variables is included following charts.

**Founding Fathers Research Projects
Past, Current and Projected Production Analysis
as of December 2009**

	Projects	John Adams	Benjamin Franklin	Thomas Jefferson	Jefferson Retirement	James Madison	George Washington	All Projects	Average
<i>Status of Project</i>	Volumes printed	42	39	41	6	32	61	221	
	Published volumes available online	31	39	33	(in progress)	(in progress)	55	158	
	Volumes to be printed	34	8	17	17	19	28	123	
	Frequency of publication	12 mos./vol.	24 mos./vol.	12 mos./vol.	12 mos./vol.	12 mos./vol.	6 mos./vol.		
	Total documents planned for all volumes	30,000	30,000	34,200	12,420	27,000	48,575	182,195	30,366
	Documents already processed	17,100	24,700	23,980	3,216	15,600	28,975	113,571	18,929
	Documents to be processed	12,900	5,300	10,220	9,204	11,400	19,600	68,624	11,437
	Documents processed per volume (average)	385	596	644	563	612	624	3,424	571
	Fully transcribed documents per volume (average)	291	449	543	563	612	624	3,082	514
<i>Project Resources</i>	No. of employees, FTE	8.00	6.00	7.00	9.60	6.50	9.50	46.60	7.77
	Annual budget 2009	\$ 700,000	\$ 672,500	\$ 850,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 4,505,500	\$ 750,917
	Grant from NHPRC in 2009	\$ 130,400	\$ 121,961	\$ 121,989	n/a	\$ 110,253	\$ 109,937	\$ 594,540	\$ 118,908
	NHPRC funds as % of annual budget	19%	18%	14%	n/a	22%	12%		17%
<i>2009 Production Rates and Costs</i>	Documents processed per year	385	298	644	563	612	1,248	3,750	625
	Average cost per document	\$ 1,818	\$ 2,257	\$ 1,320	\$ 1,510	\$ 817	\$ 748	\$	\$ 1,412
	Pages published per year	604	395	828	776	735	1,530	4,868	811
	Average cost per page	\$ 1,159	\$ 1,703	\$ 1,027	\$ 1,095	\$ 680	\$ 610	\$	\$ 1,046
<i>Projections</i>	Editors' projected years to completion	34	12	17	18	19	15		19
	Editors' estimated completion date	2043	2021	2026	2027	2028	2023		
	Projected cost to complete (current budgets)	\$ 23,800,000	\$ 8,070,000	\$ 14,450,000	\$ 15,300,000	\$ 9,500,000	\$ 13,995,000	\$ 85,115,000	\$ 14,185,833
	Projected NHPRC costs to complete	\$ 4,433,600	\$ 1,463,532	\$ 2,073,813	n/a	\$ 2,094,807	\$ 1,649,055	\$ 11,714,807	\$ 1,952,468

*The report uses the term **Documents Processed** to describe: (1). Documents in the volume that are printed in full and enumerated in the front matter of the volumes (2). Documents that are abstracted, summarized, omitted, and enumerated in other editorial devices. Because of the significant time devoted by the editors to preparing documents in the second category, those documents are added to the documents printed in full to assess the larger body of material addressed by the editors for the average volume. Missing documents, which are accounted for in a variety of ways in the volumes, are not included in this number.

Production variables

There are many variables that affect project costs and timetables. Some of these are described in more detail below.

Length of documents

Additional information reveals that there is a good deal of variation in the density of the page (characters per page) as well as the number of pages per document. The average number of character per document in the Adams Papers, at 3290, for instance, is about 25% more than the average number of characters per document in the Washington Papers, at 2717. Such variations significantly affect the rate of production.

	Pages per document	Characters per page
Adams	1.33	2,600
Franklin	1.10	2,496
Jefferson Papers	1.12	2,868
Jefferson: Retirement	1.20	2,868
Madison	1.05	3,268
Washington	1.07	2,533

Depth of indexing

Each project applies a different level of effort to indexing each volume; hence the number of pages devoted to indexing is relevant, as is index pages as a percent of the pages devoted to documents:

	Index pages as related to document pages
Adams	9.4%
Franklin	9.0%
Jefferson Papers	7.2%
Jefferson: Retirement	7.0%
Madison	8.2%
Washington	7.9%

Founding Father's Documentary Editions – Page and Document Analysis

Adams Papers	Average	Family Papers, Vol. 8	Family Papers, Vol. 9	Papers of John Adams, Vol. 14
Pages per volume	604	581	613	619
Introduction pages	51	55	48	49
Document pages	497	464	511	515
Index pages	57	62	54	55
Pages per document	1.33	1.49	1.42	1.07
Character per document	3290			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	291	246	289	338
Processed documents per volume*	385	311	360	483
		Vol. 37	Vol. 38	Vol. 39
Franklin Papers				
Pages per volume	790	880	756	735
Introduction pages	63	62	67	61
Document pages	655	746	611	609
Index pages	72	72	78	65
Pages per document	1.10	1.30	0.99	1.02
Character per document	2752			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	449	488	457	403
Processed documents per volume*	596	574	615	600
		Vol. 34	Vol. 35	Vol. 36
Jefferson Papers				
Pages per volume	828	809	872	804
Introduction pages	47	43	49	50
Document pages	720	708	759	694
Index pages	59	58	64	56
Pages per document	1.12	1.09	1.08	1.20
Character per document	3218			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	543	525	608	495
Processed documents per volume*	644	652	702	579
		Vol. 4	Vol. 5	Vol. 6
Jefferson: Retirement Papers				
Pages per volume	776	789	787	752
Introduction pages	47	40	50	51
Document pages	675	689	685	650
Index pages	54	60	52	51
Pages per document	1.20	1.19	1.16	1.26
Character per document	3446			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	563	580	592	516
Processed documents per volume*	563	580	592	516
		Presidential Series Vol. 6	Secretary-of-State Series Vol. 8	Retirement Series, Vol. 1
Madison Papers				
Pages per volume	735	810	682	713
Introduction pages	37	38	39	34
Document pages	638	711	578	625
Index pages	60	61	65	54
Pages per document	1.05	1.05	0.92	1.17
Character per document	3429			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	612	674	628	533
Processed documents per volume*	612	674	628	533
		Revolutionary War Series, Vol. 17	Revolutionary War Series, Vol. 18	Presidential Series Vol. 15
Washington Papers				
Pages per volume	765	774	743	778
Introduction pages	38	41	35	37
Document pages	667	665	643	692
Index pages	61	68	65	49
Pages per document	1.07	1.03	1.00	1.19
Character per document	2717			
Fully transcribed documents per vol.	624	648	640	583
Processed documents per volume*	624	648	640	583

*The report uses the term documents processed to describe documents in the volume that are summarized, or omitted, and enumerated in the table of contents or in appendices, calendars, or other editorial devices. Not included in this number are missing documents which are accounted for in a variety of ways in the volumes.

Appendix A: Grouped questionnaire responses

Current state of collections

See below the description of each project's collection. While each project varies somewhat, it is clear that the projects have by and large completed the identification and collection of documents to be included in their publications. Only the Adams Papers project has any sizable group to acquire, and these are from known sources. The physical sources from which they work are usually Xerox copies made from original sources, online sources, or microfilm. The Franklin Papers have the advantage of having their unpublished documents available electronically, as reasonably accurate transcriptions. The Franklin Papers have the smallest number of unpublished documents, while Washington has the largest.

14 Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The Adams Family Correspondence series includes the papers of one family. The Papers of John Adams series includes the documents of one person, incoming and outgoing.
Franklin	Almost all are Benjamin Franklin. Some letters of his grandson, William Temple Franklin.
Jefferson Papers	Thomas Jefferson.
Jefferson Retirement	Documents to and from Thomas Jefferson. A substantial collection of family letters has also been accessioned.
Madison	James Madison.
Washington	Only correspondence to and from GW (and a few Martha)

15 What percent of docs have *been* identified but not acquired?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They still need to gather executive era documents from the National Archives and the Library of Congress. This process will probably take about two years, with a researcher spending two weeks each year on-site to locate the documents. Anticipated number: 500 – 1500 documents.
Franklin	None. If anything is uncovered, it is acquired immediately.
Jefferson Papers	Almost none. Docs are acquired immediately when new items are discovered.
Jefferson Retirement	Nothing that they are aware of to or from Jefferson. Family documents are still being collected.
Madison	Only enclosures and third- party documents will be acquired. 10-20% for the executive series. While some are available on film, many will require significant research.
Washington	The only documents identified but not located are those identified in the printed volumes as "document not found." In examining three typical volumes that number is about 7%.

16 What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized?

Project	Answer
Adams	Transcription is mostly complete up to 1813. Foreign language documents are transcribed and translated more slowly because work is done by experts we consult in the particular languages. Some enclosures or other related third party documents that will not be printed have not been transcribed. Transcriptions are done well in advance of the volumes in production. Transcriptions for PJA are currently done through the next three volumes.
Franklin	The digital edition (created by the Packard Humanities Institute) includes texts of the published papers and unverified, rough transcriptions of the as-yet-unpublished material.
Jefferson Papers	Virtually all are initially transcribed.
Jefferson Retirement	They had microfilm originally. This was printed out to paper using copyflow processing. They have 15-20K documents accessioned. All documents were keyed by vendors when they began the project, so even the unpublished documents have been keyed. However, the files are very rough, and require considerable editing and clean up. They have 2 people assigned to that task. Currently on 1823 in the clean-up process (project covers 1809-1826). All checked docs are in their CMS, as is control file metadata, for documents, which are not yet checked.
Madison	All of the documents in the folders have been transcribed.
Washington	Most to be used in volumes have been transcribed (albeit roughly). [Note – Financial series info follows, but this series is not being included in this Report’s analysis: “There are over 900 docs in financial series still not transcribed. Some of the latter are multipage account books. The level of XML tagging for these documents will be much more extensive than anything they have heretofore attempted. They could easily represent as many as 5000 pages. And, these documents are in excess of what has already been done in our shop and by the interns, and, further, what has already been done is barebones transcriptions (with a minimum or no XML tagging) and there are likely to be at least 100,000 separate XML entries to be made to these pages.]”

16A How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?

Project	Answer
Adams	There are approximately 12,900 additional Adams documents from which selection will made for the remaining volumes.
Franklin	5,300
Jefferson Papers	Est. 10,200
Jefferson Retirement	Just under 10,000
Madison	11,400
Washington	Total: 19,600 docs (estimate). An unknown number of additional documents– probably several thousand – will be used (all or in part) in annotating the last 29 volumes. This may bring the total to est. 22,000.

17 Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They will exclude most receipts and forms that have merely a signature. For example when John Adams is president there will be routine documents such as commissions that he signs. These are too numerous and, unless of specific interest, would not be printed.
Franklin	They exclude lengthy enclosures, routine signed forms, most third-party documents, and incoming letters that repeat previous appeals.
Jefferson Papers	In general, third party documents are not published, sometimes legal and court decisions are not. Decisions made on a case-by-case basis. The original selection statement: "We consider for publication as we are doing the selection for each volume, all letters to and from Thomas Jefferson, and all documents in his hand." Not all documents are published in full, but all but the very routine are taken account of.
Jefferson Retirement	The only things they have omitted are items being held for the "Second Series," and some groupings of family and University of Virginia documents collected for annotation and context.
Madison	They have omitted routine documents, land and transmitted docs, enclosures. Some docs are summarized rather than reproduced in full. We include 3 rd party letters if they are relevant to research. We do include books written by JM.
Washington	They have omitted the financial papers (mentioned above), the "school papers," blank business forms and the "110 rules of civility" – but all of these ultimately will be included in the digital edition in some form.

18 Physical description: what does your unpublished collection consist of?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Most of the documents are original manuscripts held by the MHS. Some, about 30%, have been acquired from other institutions and individuals. The non MHS materials are held as photocopies.
Franklin	xerographic copies of 30,000 documents.
Jefferson Papers	All are photocopies – 70,000 documents, some of which are variant texts or third party documents used for annotation.
Jefferson Retirement	Mostly microfilm printed using copyflow, supplemented in many cases by newer digital images of the same documents.
Madison	All Xerox copies.
Washington	Most are Xerox copies, and rough transcriptions of these. The collection Washington preserved, and documents collected by other archives (letters GW sent to others). About 45% are available as digital images from the Library of Congress.

Project workflow

Because these projects have evolved, in some cases over decades, the approach each takes to accomplishing their goals is quite inconsistent. Many project Editors provided their own documented workflow description, while workflow for others was gathered during on-site visits.

Two projects, Madison and Washington, set up their workflow by assigning each volume to a single editor. While each project's entire editorial staff may participate in all volumes at various stages, each volume remains under the guidance of a single person from start to finish.

Some projects assign each document to an appropriate editor, applying their scholarly strengths; others use some combination of volume-specific vs. document-specific workflow approaches, depending on need.

Each workflow document is included here, in the following order:

- p. 34 Adams
- p. 38 Franklin
- p. 40 Jefferson Papers
- p. 42 Jefferson Retirement
- p. 44 Madison
- p. 45 Washington

Adams Papers Workflow

Production Process Overview

General Notes

- assumes two-year production cycle
- many tasks can overlap and frequently the estimated time in weeks or months is actually only at part time for the entire period. For example Collation is never done more than three hours a day to assure the highest level of concentration and accuracy.
- preparation for beginning of cycle (including review of transcriptions, etc.) should begin at least three months prior to start date
- assignment of tasks will vary based on series, staff availability, etc.
- series editor must supply catalogue copy to HUP upon request (usually one year prior to publication season)
- prior to typesetting, series editor must request CIP page from HUP
- upon completion of all typesetting (including index), series editor must submit pagination form to HUP

Transcription [ongoing]

- all English-language documents in-house
- foreign-language documents by translators (along with translation of documents)
- letters previously transcribed by typewriter require scanning and clean-up
- series editor is responsible for insuring all transcriptions/translations are done prior to beginning of two-year volume production cycle

Selection [1 month]

- organization of documents into correct chronological order
- preliminary review for selection by series editor or assistant editor using ranking system (scale of 1 to 3) and calendaring of documents
- secondary review by Editor-in-Chief
- final review and selection by series editor

Moving Transcriptions into Template [2–3 days]

- can be done either prior to 1st collation or after 1st collation (must be completed before 2d collation)
- see checklist for process of converting MSWord documents into TNT template

1st Collation [3–4 months]

- two-person tandem proofreading; for Papers, series editor and other staff member; for AFC, assistant editor and other staff member [subject to change]
- staff member enters 1st collation changes; no cross-checking required

2d Collation [3–4 months]

- can begin while 1st collation is in progress
- two-person tandem proofreading; for Papers, assistant editor and Editor-in-Chief; for AFC, series editor and Editor-in-Chief [subject to change]
- staff member enters 2d collation changes
- another staff member cross-checks inputting of 2d collation changes

Annotation and Critical Review [12–15 months]

- series editor or assistant editor inputs drop-ins for all annotation
- series editor and/or Editor-in-Chief reviews drop-ins, makes additional recommendations
- series editor and assistant editor do research and write footnotes, calendars, editorial notes for group documents, etc.
- editors should keep clear annotation worksheets to aid in verification

- all material reviewed by either series editor or assistant editor for consistency of style, correct grammar and spelling, etc. [sometimes called stylistic review or preliminary copy editing]
- critical reviews performed first by Editor-in-Chief then by series editor for other series (with editors responding to first critical review before passing along for second review)
- verification should not begin until both critical reviews are complete and series editor and/or assistant editor have responded to critiques

Illustrations [4 months]

- series editor and/or assistant editor decide on 10–12 illustrations (keep list of ideas during collation and annotation processes)
- editorial assistant (or other staff member) researches and locates illustrations, obtains permission to use
- series editor and/or assistant editor drafts descriptive list of illustrations
- descriptive list must receive same review process as other material (research, stylistic review, critical review, verification, copy editing, typesetting, indexing)

Permissions [3 months]

- editorial assistant requests courtesy permission to publish letters not owned by MHS
- citation information is verified through this process
- permissions must be complete before book can go to typesetting

Frontmatter [1 month]

- assistant editor prepares frontmatter in template (using previous volume as model)
- series editor drafts introduction and acknowledgments
- assistant editor or other staff member compiles guide to editorial apparatus after completion of verification
- introduction, acknowledgments, guide to editorial apparatus, and rest of frontmatter must receive same review process as other material (research as needed, stylistic review, critical review, verification, copy editing, typesetting, indexing)

Endmatter (minus Index) [1–2 weeks]

- series editor, assistant editor, or other staff member compiles list of omitted documents (for AFC and PJA) and chronology (for AFC and Diaries)
- endmatter must receive same review process as other material (research as needed, stylistic review, critical review, verification, copy editing, typesetting, indexing)

Verification [3 months]

- all factual information in footnotes and editorial notes must be independently verified by staff members not involved in research or writing of annotation
- descriptive notes should be verified separately
- list of omitted documents should be verified separately including final check against control file to insure all appropriate documents either included in volume or on list
- other items to verify include descriptive list of illustrations, introduction, acknowledgments, guide to editorial apparatus, and chronology
- series editor or assistant editor reviews and inputs all verification corrections (verifiers should not input own corrections but work exclusively on paper); other staff member cross-checks corrections

Copy editing [3 months]

- contact freelance copy editor 2–3 months in advance
- should be done in batches in revolving-door fashion
- items to copy edit include descriptive notes and footnotes of main text, translations, any editorial notes, descriptive list of illustrations, introduction, acknowledgments, guide to editorial apparatus, list of omitted documents, and chronology

- series editor and/or assistant editor reviews and inputs all copy editing corrections; other staff member cross-checks corrections

Typesetting [2 months]

- series editor and/or assistant editor finalize galleys (after inputting and cross-checking all copy editing corrections), adding running heads, adjusting footnote styling, placing illustrations, etc.
- staff members perform galley checks on all materials including front- and endmatter [see separate checklist for galley check]
- typesetting can be completed in batches; no more than 4 batches for main text; frontmatter and endmatter can be treated as separate batches
- accounts should be typeset separately and reviewed for accuracy by several staff members
- all corrections must be cross-checked by another staff member
- series editor and/or Editor-in-Chief do final review of galleys before uploading to TNT (project typesetters)
- galleys are submitted to TNT for page layout via uploading; TNT will contact when pages are ready for downloading in PDF format; keep master copy of galleys for eventual proofreading
- no galleys can be submitted until all permissions (for text and illustrations) have cleared

Jacket Preparation [1 week]

- draft jacket text using previous volumes as model
- submit to HUP for typesetting, layout
- proofread jacket proofs and review closely
- multiple staff members should review at all stages

Proofreading [1 month]

- pageproofs from TNT receive character-by-character proofread against master galleys and pageproof check [see separate checklist]; all available staff members assist
- errors returned to TNT for correction (as many rounds as necessary)
- Editor-in-Chief and series editor do final review of pageproofs

Indexing [3–4 months]

- series editor or assistant editor does first pass review and inputting of index entries (working in Cindex)
- assistant editor (or other editor) does second pass review, checking all first pass entries and adding additional entries as appropriate (which first pass person will input into Cindex)
- Editor-in-Chief does third pass review, checking all second pass entries and adding additional entries as appropriate (which first pass person will input into Cindex)
- all available staff members assist in consolidation of entries upon Editor-in-Chief's completion of third pass review
- after consolidation, index is converted to MSWord for alphabetization of subentries, full copy edit (as well as other index checks—see separate checklist), and verification of all identifiers
- all corrections (including alphabetization) must be cross-checked by different staff member
- after thorough review, index is converted to TNT template and receives galley check [see checklist]
- TNT typesets and returns as PDFs
- pageproofs from TNT receive character-by-character proofreading of index against master galleys and pageproof check; all available staff members assist
- errors returned to TNT for correction (as many rounds as necessary)
- prior to typesetting, colophon information must be verified with HUP

PDFs to Harvard / Final Wrap-up [1–2 days]

- TNT submits final PDFs for one final review by series editor or assistant editor
- series editor or assistant editor gives e-mail approval to TNT and HUP
- assistant editor compiles archival box and organizes archival digital files
- bound books due 4–6 weeks after submission date (HUP to supply exact information)

Note on the chart below: the six month periods for each category of the process show when that aspect of the edition is completed not the total time to complete it. For example, Annotation for PJA 16 falls into the Jan–June 2011 time. Annotation takes a year or more but will be completed during that period.

The Adams Papers
Plan of Work

	<i>Papers of John Adams</i> , vol. 15	<i>Adams Family Correspondence</i> , vol. 10	<i>Papers of John Adams</i> , vol. 16	<i>Adams Family Correspondence</i> , vol. 11	<i>Diary of Louisa Catherine Adams</i> , 2 vols.
Transcription	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Preliminary Selection	✓	✓	✓	July-Dec. 2010	N/A
Final Selection	✓	✓	July-Dec. 2009	Jan.-June 2011	N/A
1st Collation	✓	✓	Jan.-June 2010	Jan.-June 2011	✓
2nd Collation	✓	✓	July-Dec. 2010	July-Dec. 2011	✓
Illustrations & Permissions	✓	July-Dec. 2009	July-Dec. 2010	July-Dec. 2011	July-Dec. 2009
Annotation	✓	Jan.-June 2010	Jan.-June 2011	Jan.-June 2012	Jan.-June 2010
Critical Read & Verification	✓	July-Dec. 2010	July-Dec. 2011	TBD	Jan.-June 2010
Production	July-Dec. 2009	July-Dec. 2010	July-Dec. 2011	TBD	July-Dec. 2010
Index	July-Dec. 2009	July-Dec. 2010	July-Dec. 2011	TBD	July-Dec. 2010
Final Production	Jan.-June 2010	Jan.-June 2011	Jan.-June 2012	TBD	July-Dec. 2010
Publication	Jan.-June 2010	Jan.-June 2011	Jan.-June 2012	TBD	Jan.-June 2011

✓	= Completed Task
July-Dec. 2009	= July-Dec. 2009
Jan.-June 2010	= Jan.-June 2010
July-Dec. 2010	= July-Dec. 2010
Jan.-June 2011	= Jan.-June 2011
July-Dec. 2011	= July-Dec. 2011
Jan.-June 2012	= Jan.-June 2012

Franklin Papers Workflow

Because Benjamin Franklin's interests and activities are so varied, the editorial work on this project is assigned topically, with each editor responsible for a subject area, a given correspondent, a theme, or some combination.

Volumes are published chronologically. Their chronological control file has already been broken into volumes, so all unpublished documents have already been assigned to a volume, based on work done over the years. Each control file card contains name (not BF), date of document, and accession number. There are triplicate control files, established at the beginning of the project: by correspondent, date, and accession number.

Editors work together, volume-by-volume. First step is to assign documents, and determine which will be printed in full and which will be summarized. (This done by Editor-in-Chief)

1. One person takes ownership of a single document. They do research for the annotation, keeping detailed notes, and draft annotation. If document is part of a continuing story, all the documents in that story are researched and annotated together.
 2. Responsible editor does the first proofreading. They read for meaning.
 3. Then tandem proofreaders read docs for transcription details. They read against copies of the handwritten originals, and, to insure consistency in and across volumes, refer to the project's notebook of "handwriting decisions," a record of each correspondent's idiosyncrasies and how the project has decided to render them.
 4. Those documents held by major archives that are within a reasonable distance from New Haven (Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington DC), as well as those owned by Yale University, receive one final verification against the original mss by editors who make periodic trips to these cities. This allows them to transcribe segments that cannot be read from their on-site photostats (passages obscured by tape or cut off altogether), decipher difficult passages, and verify that the entire manuscript was copied in the first place. (For example, one library neglected to copy the reverse side of the documents when making the photostats.)
 5. Annotation – Editor A drafts footnotes, gives them to Editor B to check
Editor B reads the doc & footnotes, checks notes for accuracy and completeness, notes corrections and gives it back
Editor A evaluates B's comments, makes corrections, prints final version
Final version of doc and footnotes placed in binders. Binders grow as volume progresses
Editor-in-Chief does final review.
Texts: She marks final corrections, based on the readings at archives and her own check of the photostats. These go to Adm. Asst. for entering into master files.
Annotation: she reads for clarity, accuracy, and overall balance. She spots problems, sends docs back to editors for further research and revision, conducts further research of her own (when that is more efficient), rewrites as required. For recent volumes, because of the influx of inexperienced editors as senior editors have retired, this has taken a full year. She works with editors during this process as part of their training.
- Editor-in-Chief makes corrections to annotation files herself, then sends them back to the owning editor for a final proofing and ships them electronically to Administrative Assistant. All final corrections to annotation are made by an Administrative Assistant.
6. Documents assigned to collective summaries -- This concept was devised to handle the crush of miscellaneous correspondence BF received in France. Editors cull out letters to BF that may have been of little consequence to him and that to the best of our knowledge he does not answer, usually from strangers and almost always in French, German, Italian, or Latin. Editors divide these into categories: favor-seekers, commission-seekers, would-be emigrants, composers of

verse, people offering goods and schemes. Each document is summarized in a single paragraph, preserving proper names and all important concepts. (These are therefore accessible through the Index.) The paragraphs are woven into editorial essays, and receive light annotation. Each essay is "anchored" by a sample document, published in full. One editor organizes and writes each essay; thereafter, the process of annotation, checking, and final review is the same as above.

7. The Administrative Assistant has the master files, and does the markup for the Press.

8. Table of Contents is generated by the Administrative Assistant based on an electronic flow chart. Every document is listed. (Nothing is calendared.) Those documents that are not published in full (described in a collective summary or noted in annotation) are set off by an asterisk, and cite the place where the document is described. The Tables of Contents of the entire edition are therefore a complete chronological record of Franklin's correspondence.

9. Illustrations are identified; photographs are ordered; permissions are obtained; the List of Illustrations is written.

10. The volume goes to the Press, they get page proofs back – reviewed, corrections made.

11. An index is prepared using CINDEK.

12. Second page proofs received, reviewed, corrections made – back to the Press. Index proofs received, corrected.

13. Their online version is updated after a volume is published, so that unpublished docs are replaced with the published ones. All changes to master database are also made, beyond the period of the volume -- including new identifications of correspondents and redating of documents.

See below an example of the tracking chart which is kept as an Excel spreadsheet:

language	text prepared	introduction	working	notes drafted	ref checked	final ERC	Doc #	Date	Title	*Glob*	Responsibility	Notes	TOC Entry
n/a	n/a	n/a					806		Introduction				Introduction,
n/a	n/a	n/a					807		Editorial Note on Accounts		KMO		Editorial Note on Accounts,
n/a	n/a	n/a					808		Editorial Note on Promissory Notes		KMO	(1 in vol.)	Editorial Note on Promissory Notes,
x	x	x	x	x	x		811	September 16	To Richard Price		MAS		To Richard Price, September 16
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		812	September 16	From Prince Bariatinski, with Franklin's Note for a Reply		JRD		From Prince Bariatinski, with Franklin's Note for a Reply, Septemb
x	x	x	x	x	x		813	September 16	From Sir Edward Newenham		MAS		From Sir Edward Newenham, September 16
y	y	y	x				814	September 16	From Mlle E. Stubbs	[237]		[041]	*From Mlle E. Stubbs, September 16: see page [237]
Fr	y						816	September 17	From ;3m d'avelange	[237]		[041]	*From ;3m d'avelange, September 17: see page [237]
x	x	x	x	x	x		817	September 17	From James Bennet		KMO		From James Bennet, September 17
Fr	y		y				818	September 17	From Pierre Carrel	[242]			*From Pierre Carrel, September 17: see page [242]
x	x	x	x	x	x		819	September 17	From Robert Morris		MAS		From Robert Morris, September 17
x	x	x	x	x	x		824	September 17	From Patrick Murphy et al.		KMO		From Patrick Murphy et al., September 17
Fr	y						821	[before September 16]	From Graf von Schönfeld	[373]			*From Graf von Schönfeld, [before September 16]: see page [373]
x	x	x	x	x	x		822	September 18	To Benjamin Rush		MAS		To Benjamin Rush, September 18
x	x	x	x	x	x		823	September 18	From Samuel Chase		MAS		From Samuel Chase, September 18
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		825	[September 18?]	From Jean-Baptiste Le Roy		JRD		From Jean-Baptiste Le Roy, [September 18?]
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		826	September 18	From Pierre-Antoine-Jean Remond		KD		From Pierre-Antoine-Jean Remond, September 18
x	x	x	x	x	x		820	September 19	From James Bennet: Promissory Note	[003]			*From James Bennet: Promissory Note, September 19: see page
x	x	x	x	x	x		827	September 19	From Anthony Todd		JRD		From Anthony Todd, September 19
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		867	[after September 19]	Franklin: Satire on Hot Air		PZ		Franklin: Satire on Hot Air, [after September 19]
x	x	x	x	x	x		828	September 20	John Thaxter, Jr. to the American Peace Comm.		JRD		John Thaxter, Jr. to the American Peace Comm., September 20
-	x	x	x	x	x		831	[after September 20]	Extracts of John Bayne's Journal		MAS		Extracts of John Bayne's Journal, [after September 20]
x	x	x	x	x	x		829	September 21	From Henry Laurens		JRD		From Henry Laurens, September 21
x	x	x	x	x	x		830	September 21	From Robert Pigott		MAS		From Robert Pigott, September 21
Fr	x	y	y				836	September 21	From Remond	826n	KD		*From Remond, September 21: see page 826n
x	x	x	x	x	x		832	September 23	To Richard Bache		MAS		To Richard Bache, September 23
x	x	x	x	x	x		833	September 23	From James Bowdoin		MAS		From James Bowdoin, September 23
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		834	September 23	From Jean Zinner		KD		From Jean Zinner, September 23
x	x	x	x	x	x		835	September 24	From David Hartley		JRD		From David Hartley, September 24
Fr	x	x	x	x	x		837	September 24	From the Comte de Mercy-Argenteau		JRD		From the Comte de Mercy-Argenteau, September 24
Fr	y						840	September 25	From ;3m Desfours	[506]			*From ;3m Desfours, September 25: see page [506]

Jefferson Papers Work Flow Chart

Prepared by Barbara Oberg

Preparation of the texts and Preliminary Selection of Documents

Transcriptions

98 % of ours are done from back in the 1950s and '60s. They were put into HTML form by the Packard Humanities Institute some years ago. The occasional new transcription needed is done by Editorial Assistant. While these are "raw" transcripts, they are in quite good shape. Exceptions are the documents that were made on TJ's copy press, which are pretty much mud to read. Those take a ton of work throughout the editorial process, as we procure scans, go to the archives to work with the originals, and figure out words as we learn more about the context and content of the letter while doing the research for the annotation.

First verification & draft descriptive notes

Research Associate, has done some of the first verifications. Assistant Editors and Editorial Assistant do the largest number right now. We try to stay 2-3 vols. ahead of the actual editing. The descriptive notes (identifying provenance, describing the manuscript, & identifying enclosures): in the straightforward cases, the first verifiers draft them; in complicated cases they are left for a senior associate editor, who reviews and makes changes as needed.

Selection, allocation

A list of all documents that MIGHT be printed is pulled from our database. Editor goes through it to identify documents that will be used in annotation, not printed in full. Documents are allocated to editors. I consult with the two Senior Associate Editors to achieve "evenness" of load.

Distribution of files

In the "old days," Editorial Assistant would then "distribute" the live electronic files to the editors responsible for the annotation. Now, with PubMan, each editor "checks out" the package of docs. he/she will work on.

Annotation of the Volumes (Preparation and Annotation, i.e. editing), takes about a year)

Annotation & creation of running index by individual editors

Annotation, the heart of the editing begins. Even though eds. have their specialties, we try to keep the eds. more or less together as they work forward chronologically. This can be a challenge, but it's even harder if one person gets way ahead or falls way back. We meet regularly to discuss issues that overlap in each other's documents.

Create Running index. Merge individual annotation files into 1. Research Associate check.

We tend to work in 5 day chunks (of TJ's life) & set a date for finishing the 5 days. Then all files are returned to Editorial Assistant. She combines & prints them for Research Associate to do his fact checking.

Second Verification

The ed. who annotates the document is responsible for second verification. That ed. knows the handwriting of the particular correspondent. Part of this process is also ordering scans when needed (and possible) from different repositories for clarifying hard passages and/or going to repositories—esp. Library of Congress.

Third Verification & Review Process

BBO reviews, going binder by binder. I verify text again, read text & annotation for sense, & shorten as needed. (If extensive revision necessary, I get the live file to use & make my changes there. Otherwise, Editorial Assistant makes the changes that are marked on paper. I ask the sr.

assoc. eds. to review docs in which they have special expertise. One of the senior associate editors does a read through. I go back over complicated things, questions, etc.

Making Corrections to files—putting the review results into the files.

Only Editorial Assistant makes changes to the live files at this stage. Some files have already been substantially revised, and so we incorporate them as “inserts” rather than rekeying.

Checks and more checks

The corrected files, which we call Edit 1, are checked by two people against the prior version. We check at every stage at which changes are made, & keep a paper trail of each stage. In the age of computers we seem to use just as much paper, I fear!

Final Review

This is a little free-form and collaborative and is designed to let eds. see what changes I have made. It's really just a final chance for them to know what I did and for me to consult with individual editors as I need to. We also do significant work on the front matter at this point.

From Submission to Publication (add another year)³⁴

Review by Designer and PUP editorial & marketing

We try to submit in late fall, and 2-3 months elapse before it “goes into production.” Sometime in here we are asked for catalogue and jacket copy.

Off to Stephen Perkins

When the designer has marked up specs to her satisfaction, the editorial dept. at the Press oks it, & marketing fits it into the catalogue schedule. Then goes to Stephen Perkins. We get a production schedule set by Stephen & Press (they consult with us).

Page proofs back to us for creating index & reviewing the proofs

I think for Volume 36 Stephen had the files for almost 3 months before the batches started coming back to us. I am hoping this will shorten a bit with our full use of PubMan.

First revises of pages and page proofs of index come in

This usually happens within maybe 6 weeks of our returning the pages. We check and recheck the changes we'd marked on the proofs; sometimes new errors have been introduced. We review index proofs.

Revised pp. of index, 2nd revises of pp. blue lines, placement of illustrations.

These are all the final pre-production tasks, and they happen roughly 2-3 months before we have bound copies in the warehouse. If we have submitted in Nov., we have advance copies by late Dec. (for Christmas presents!). The whole cycle has taken about 13 months in recent years, but we anticipate something of a shortening of that time frame.

³⁴ This scenario was in place for the last couple of volumes. We prepared them in Word, using our special Monticello Font that our volumes are set in and then the Press sent to Stephen Perkins for composition. Beginning with Volume 37, which is in PubMan, I expect there will be variations. We'll need to work that through with the Press, though since they have had the experience of the Jefferson Retirement volumes, I hope it will go fairly smoothly.

Jefferson Papers Retirement Series – Workflow

They have 10 people, divided into three teams

The total docs have been roughly divided into volumes. Each Editorial team completes a volume every two years, alternating to produce a publication schedule of one volume per year.

Digital team – 2 people – take the raw keyed transcriptions and clean them up, improve tags & links, and move them to the CMS. (They also monitor the CMS, software, keep track of the library of scanned documents which they are collecting.)

Editorial Team (2 teams) – each have one Sr and one Jr Editor, plus an Editorial Assistant. The Editorial Assistants are not assigned one to each team, but rather they both float between the two teams as needed.

1. Each editorial team will take a volume's-worth of documents and divide them between themselves, as they see fit. Usually they split them along chronological lines, although sometimes they will take a subject-oriented approach.

2. They review their assigned documents, and make a decision on what to include and what to omit.

3. Verification is the next step:

first they sight read (one editor comparing the transcription to the original document.)

Then they carry out a tandem oral proofreading.

Finally, they exchange documents, and each Editor does a sight read of the other Editor's assigned documents.

The tandem proofreading does not necessarily occur between the two sight readings, but it is required that all three verifications take place before the document is bumped up to "verified" status.

In difficult cases specific queries are addressed or entire documents re-verified against the original manuscript. To improve readings, transcriptions are also checked against the versions in other reputable documentary editions.

4. Annotation: The responsible Editor does annotation on their assigned docs.

Writes biographical IDs, source notes, textual notes, collates drafts and other secondary texts against the master text.

Does research for the Index

Adds subject-oriented tags (e.g., names)

Annotation is grounded in primary sources wherever possible. Cross-referencing is kept to a minimum by relying instead on the index as a way to get from one document to another and, similarly, annotation is avoided when upcoming documents are going to answer the question one might have in reading a specific document.

5. Annotated docs are reviewed by Jeff (Editor-in-Chief)

6. Fact checking of source notes, annotation, textual notes, and front matter is carried out by Editorial Assistants.

7. Once fact checking is complete (and any corrections made) the docs are stitched together in a chronological arrangement.

8. Sense reading is done by Team 1, then by Team 2,

9. It is reviewed by Jeff, He resolves changes, through several rounds until there are no more.

10. It goes off to the Press

11. The index is generated from within the transcriptions, using links, and tags for the page-breaks. The index points to the spot on the page where the item being referenced begins and ends. The result is a more powerful, dynamic index, and the later stages of proofing are easier. One can also do some of the work during the annotation process instead of waiting for page proofs. Overall, however, this system is not probably going to turn out to save time over the traditional indexing systems.

12. Page proofs are reviewed and corrected until no further errors are found.

Madison Papers Workflow

There is one editor in charge of each series. They all follow the same workflow.

They begin with the control file cards for a volume.

White cards – they have a copy of the original.

Blue cards – they know about it, but don't have a copy.

Yellow cards – these are 3rd party docs, probably not to be included.

They assure that all white and blue cards have a copy and transcription.

A cover page is created for each document (this sheet tracks everything about the doc, including who handled it, transcribed, proofed, etc.)

1. The editor files the cover sheet, and a printout of the transcription in ring binders.
2. First proofreading is done by the editor:
 - Checks the transcription / make corrections in the Word file on the spot.
 - Roughs out the annotation / marks document with numbers where annotations are required.
 - Keys the annotation rough sheet and files it in the binder behind the document.Editor does research, writes the annotations, adds them to the file as they are complete.
3. Next step is tandem proofreading. File folders are pulled to provide originals to read against (sometimes they read against the Internet online copy of the original). If printouts are too marked up with corrections they are reprinted after corrections have been made to the file. Sometimes corrections are made to the file without the need to reprint it.
4. Next step: fact checking. The book goes to the Research Asst. who is told to “assume everything is wrong.” They check facts, and sometimes suggest edits.
5. The book now goes to John Stagg, Editor-in-Chief. He will read, correct, and suggest edits. (He is also involved in the process in various ways prior to receiving books/volumes for more formal review.)
6. Editor then reviews John's comments, document by document, making corrections.
7. The volume is now handed over to the in-house Copy Editor (notebook by notebook). She approaches each document and annotation as though no one had touched it, and returns it with comments and corrections (a “forest of sticky-notes”). This process takes about one month per notebook (about six notebooks per volume).
8. The editor now addresses all the concerns raised by the Copy Editor. At this point, the entire book is printed out.
9. All other staff, excluding the book's editor, now participates in another tandem proofreading. The volume is returned to editor for corrections.
10. The Copy Editor then codes the book for typography – headers, provenance, special characters, etc.
11. The Editor has meantime been compiling the front matter, Table of Contents, and headers for documents. With this incorporated, it is off to the Press.
12. The Press returns Page Proofs.
13. Editor creates the index.
14. Copy Editor and others do another tandem proofreading against the ring binder.
15. Copy Editor checks the index. Back to the Press.
16. The Press sends “revises” along the way, and they are checked by the Editor.

Washington Papers Workflow

Each volume is assigned to a single editor -- 4 altogether, each producing one volume every other year. When a new editor is hired they spend two years training with an experienced editor. For a new editor's first volume, or on an editor's first volume using PubMan/XML, 3 months are added to the allotted time for production. However, it is anticipated that, once they have converted entirely, working in PubMan/XML will take about the same amount of time as before, i.e. 24 months to complete a volume. The two advantages of using PubMan/XML is (1) that the same output file will support both letterpress and digital publication, and (2) that the cumulative index will be updated as the volume index is created. Current experience suggests that indexing using PubMan will take somewhat longer than before. It is possible that by adopting PubMan the project may have to allow 25-26 months per volume, but that is not yet been determined.

They have most letters in very rough transcription. Often have 2 or more versions per document. Initial transcriptions were often accomplished by student workers and made from the most legible version, leaving it to the volume editor to pick the most authoritative version and prepare a transcription of that version. When available the recipient copy is usually considered the most authoritative version. Other versions may include a draft, or letterbook copy or sometimes a copy made by the recipient.

Workflow steps:

- 1) Rough transcription by students using the most easily read version of the document. [This step is almost essentially complete.]
- 2) Collate (compare versions/select most authoritative) edit the rough transcription and note variances with other versions.
- 3) Annotation begun (sometimes there are draft notes created in step 2).
- 4) Search for new documents when evidence suggests their existence.
- 5) Research, using all types of resources – other documents, secondary works, old newspapers, online, ancestry.com.
- 6) Annotation continued.
- 7) Copy editor checks transcriptions / fact checking.
- 8) Editor-in-Chief (Ted) reviews the work, makes suggestions.
- 9) Editor makes corrections/ changes / additions.
- 10) Copy editor (and graduate students working for the copy editor) scrubs it.
- 11) Goes to the copy editor at the Press.
- 12) Copy goes to offsite proof reader who reads the volume onto tape.
- 13) Page proofs come back / checked against what was sent to the press— corrected, checked again.
- 14) Off site proof reader checks final page proofs against taped version.
- 15) Proof reader corrections made.
- 16) Editor creates index.

They do not do tandem proofreading in-house. It is done off-site using a recording.

Technology status

Depending on the genesis of the project, adoption of technologies varies. While automation is used in all cases, some work within simple word-processing solutions, while others make use of content management systems and sophisticated XML editing environments.

Only a small percentage of collected documents have not been initially transcribed, at least in word-processing formats. These initial transcriptions are often quite rough, and have usually not been proofread.

Most projects provide online access to their published materials, or are in the planning stages of doing so. Three of the six projects already offer some or all of their published documents online freely available to the public. A fourth plans to do so in the future. Each of these free online sources is offered independently, making it impossible for them to be cross-searched. Except for the recently launched Early Access database, only one, Franklin, offers online access to documents not yet published in printed volumes.

19 How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Transcription is mostly complete up to 1813.
Franklin	All of it. Transcriptions of everything that will be published in future volumes are online. Most of the remainder (enclosures, etc.) is also online. The Packard Humanities Institute maintains the database and updates after volumes are published.
Jefferson Papers	Almost all has been keyed; only the occasional newly found document needs keying.
Jefferson Retirement	Most has been keyed by Apex, but the unpublished documents still need considerable clean-up.
Madison	All of the documents in the folders have been transcribed.
Washington	Most of the unpublished material is keyed, but not proofread.

20 What format?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Word.
Franklin	They sent typescripts (most from the 1950s) to be keyed by vendors in 1988. The original keyed documents were made available on CD-ROMs. The switch to web access was made in 2006. Format appears to be XML compatible, but this is not verified as yet.
Jefferson Papers	Originally documents were typed. Then the Packard Humanities Institute had them converted to HTML. We worked with them in Word in recent years, and Dataformat is now converting them to XML for edit in Xmetal.
Jefferson Retirement	XML.
Madison	Word.
Washington	All transcribed material is now in XML.

21 Has it been proofread?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They do not start verification to publication standards until the documents have been selected for a volume.
Franklin	The documents which are unpublished have not been proofed.
Jefferson Papers	At least three, and possibly as many as eight, volumes ahead of where the editors are working have had a first verification.
Jefferson Retirement	Most unpublished documents have been cleaned up to some extent, but none proofed against originals.
Madison	No.
Washington	None of the documents for volumes not yet underway have been proofread.

22 Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, organizations?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The office maintains an extensive genealogical name file, bibliography, and directory of residences for editorial production uses. Otherwise the extensive index in each volume offers a controlled glossary of people, places titles and organizations.
Franklin	The Digital Franklin Papers is a complete record of every document. It includes a Master Index of Names, created by the project, which takes into account all variant forms. It also contains biographical sketches of nearly all correspondents. All letters written to/by any individual or organization can be sorted independently. In addition, the project has completed the first draft of a cumulative index, which creates an authority file. Individual volume indexes are currently searchable on the project's website; the draft cumulative index will soon be available on the website. The Packard Humanities Institute makes all changes to datelines and title lines as well as texts, as each volume is published, relocating documents as necessary and revising index of proper names.
Jefferson Papers	Not as such, but the ongoing cumulative index serves that purpose.
Jefferson Retirement	We have in PubMan a title for places and for people, and are trying to standardize.
Madison	No.
Washington	No, but they are currently creating a cumulative index. Once complete, the cumulative index will be updated automatically by PubMan as each new volume index is created.

23 Do you have a name authority system in place?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The office currently has an extensive genealogical name file (paper) and the digital cumulative index provides the full name (and life dates when possible) that has been indexed in a volume. The control file digitization project is currently building a supporting database of all Adams correspondents that will link to the main control file database and will include the full name (life dates and titles when possible) of all person who appear in the control file.
Franklin	See above. Digital Edition includes a Master Names Index.
Jefferson Papers	See above. For our day-to-day work, the most authoritative version of a name is the one in the most recent volume's index.
Jefferson Retirement	See above.
Madison	No- just the index.
Washington	No – but they are building one de facto via the cumulative index.

24 What technology are you using to support your editorial process?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The intellectual control of the project resides in the control file. This file has been fully digitized and is currently being encoded in a custom-designed XML schema. It will be ready for editorial and public use by January 2011. The book production process uses a custom-designed template in MS Word, created by the typesetter, TnT. We use the template through all phases of book production and retain control of the files until the final page proofs. The office currently uses MS Word and Excel to manage workflow and track progress. Cindex is used for indexing.
Franklin	They create a flowchart using Excel to keep track of all tasks for each document, volume by volume. Flowcharts are already created for all future volumes. Transcriptions of all unpublished documents, digitized by Packard and available on the website, are downloaded for editors' use onto our PCs and are the basis of what we submit to the Press. All control file information was also digitized by Packard and is available on the CD-ROM and on editors' PCs. Editors use a shared folder on university computer network to share annotation, research notes, style guide, PDFs of previous volumes, indexes, etc. Project uses WordPerfect, submits WordPerfect files to Yale University Press. Doesn't put docs into XML.
Jefferson Papers	In order to assist its work, the project has transferred the information from its document control slips to a database, which was created in Microsoft Access. This is used to note which documents are allocated to which editor, and whether the document is printed in full, summarized, or described in annotation. The project installed the PubMan content management system, which became operational earlier this year. The XMetal software associated with this system enables the editors to encode texts suitable for both book and online publication.
Jefferson Retirement	Dataformat's PubMan is our CMS. We use XMetal for editing. All control file information has been loaded to the CMS. Digital images of many documents have been linked to the database.
Madison	We work in Word. We have no intention to use a CMS.
Washington	PubMan content management system, XMetal text editor – and Oxygen for some purposes.

25 Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Building on the work of the Adams Papers, the MHS has digitized the full correspondence between John and Abigail Adams (images and transcripts), the complete John Adams Diaries and Autobiography (images and transcripts) and the complete John Quincy Adams Diaries (15,000 pages of images).
Franklin	
Jefferson Papers	We purchase scans of materials from the repositories when needed to assist with a better reading of the manuscript.
Jefferson Retirement	They are making arrangements to acquire scans of originals from major sources. They already have a large number, taken from 9 biggest repositories, loaded into their CMS. They are for internal editorial use only.
Madison	For the Retirement Series, they scanned all the letters for which they had old typescripts. Madison's 1806 pamphlet on neutral rights (some 250 pages) will also have to be scanned before work can begin. No mss copies or drafts survive.
Washington	No.

26 If so, what format / standards?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	These are all XML files and are run through XSL style sheets.
Franklin	
Jefferson	
Jefferson Retirement	In most cases they acquired 300-dpi or better jpegs, combined the images for each text in a pdf, added repository information and control numbers, and linked it to their database.
Madison	
Washington	

27 What percentage is scanned?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	
Franklin	
Jefferson Papers	A small percentage.
Jefferson Retirement	Of the overall corpus, this is 80%.
Madison	
Washington	

28 Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	[19 & 28 the same question?]
Franklin	Nearly all is keyed; not all proofread.
Jefferson Papers	Material has been systematically double keyboarded through the Packard Humanities Institute.
Jefferson Retirement	Yes – keyed by Apex.
Madison	All has been keyed.
Washington	The first 52 volumes were prepared by Apex for Rotunda.

29 What standards/format?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	These are all XML files and are run through XSL style sheets.
Franklin	Will need to consult Packard.
Jefferson Papers	Dataformat is converting them to XML for edit in Xmetal.
Jefferson Retirement	They started with MEP tags, modified them to suit their style. They are not fully TEI compliant at this point, although they expect to work with a consultant to achieve full TEI compliance in the future.
Madison	Word.
Washington	XML, TEI P5.

30 How much is complete?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	
Franklin	All of it. Transcriptions of everything that will be published in future volumes are online. Most of what we will not publish (enclosures, third-party documents, etc.) is also online, so that users of the letterpress edition can read full texts.
Jefferson Papers	Almost all.
Jefferson:Retirement	All.
Madison	All.
Washington	Work on these 52 volumes by Apex has been completed, but the project is still trying to identify yet undetected errors introduced by Apex in these volumes.

31 Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They are currently online with Rotunda and Massachusetts Historical Society.
Franklin	Yes, available online through the Packard Humanities Institute.
Jefferson Papers	Yes.
Jefferson Retirement	Yes.
Madison	Yes.
Washington	Digital files for all volumes after the first 52 are available and all future volumes are being prepared in XML.

32 Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Yes, Rotunda.
Franklin	None other than the Packard Humanities Institute. They have been approached by Rotunda, but Board has not yet agreed.
Jefferson Papers	Yes, Rotunda.
Jefferson Retirement	Rotunda will publish vols 1-4 at the end of this year.
Madison	Yes, Rotunda.
Washington	Yes, Rotunda.

33 What is the status of that goal?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	30 volumes now online.
Franklin	All published and unpublished documents currently online, with free access.
Jefferson Papers	A beta version was made available on April 13, 2009 (Jefferson's birthday), and it is now a part of Rotunda's Founding Era collection. The cumulative index and indices to Vols. 22-33, will very soon be up and available along with the volumes.
Jefferson Retirement	Vols 1-4 In process.
Madison	Rotunda will have Madison online in the Spring of 2010.
Washington	55 of the printed volumes are now online. 3 more are ready to be placed on line. Others will be placed online about two years after their publication in volumes.

34 If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Avg. views?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	"The last report concerning the Adams Papers online at the MHS website was for the month of September 2009. The following is copied from the report supplied by the MHS: 'For Sept 2009, the Founding Families section of the website received 2,300 total visits, and 1,402 <i>unique</i> visitors. Those visitors viewed an average of 43 pages each, or a total of about 100,000 pages total (as opposed to about 9 pages each for <i>all</i> visitors to the website in general), and stayed an average of about 15 minutes each visit (as opposed to 2 mins, 22 sec for all visitors.)' The MHS considers this a great success."
Franklin	Free online, highly successful. Page views last monitored in September, 2007, when site was visited 13,230 times by users in 154 countries around the globe. Page views totaled over 94,000. In 2009 Packard Humanities Institute made available the "metadata" to Stanford University graduate students participating in the "Digging Into the Enlightenment: Mapping the Republic of Letters" project, recipient of a "Digging Into Data" challenge grant from the NEH.
Jefferson Papers	Rotunda has a non-exclusive agreement with Princeton University Press. Rotunda has converted 33 volumes and incorporated them into their Founding Era Collection online publications. A good review is just out in <i>Library Journal</i> .
Jefferson Retirement	Too soon to tell.
Madison	NA
Washington	Approximately 35 standing order subscriptions sold to date.

35 If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Yes, online from both Rotunda and Massachusetts Historical Society. No reports from Rotunda yet, but for MHS free access see reply to #34 above.
Franklin	Currently one source only.
Jefferson Papers	The Packard Humanities Institute does plan to make the documents available (as they did with the Franklin Papers) but we don't know what the timeframe is.
Jefferson Retirement	Only one source.
Madison	NA
Washington	All of the documents in the digital edition are available in an online edition from Mt. Vernon – but this version does not include annotations.

36 Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Yes, Massachusetts Historical Society makes them available for free.
Franklin	Already provided. A digital version of the Franklin Papers, created and maintained by the Packard Humanities Institute.
Jefferson Papers	The Packard Humanities Institute version would be free.
Jefferson Retirement	Not currently planning to make files available for free, as this would undercut the Rotunda product.
Madison	No.
Washington	Yes, the Mount Vernon version is free.

Administrative issues

This section discusses project management, staffing, and ownership issues.

7 Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Yes, Harvard University Press.
Franklin	Yes, Yale University Press.
Jefferson Papers	Yes, Princeton University Press.
Jefferson Retirement	Yes. Princeton University Press.
Madison	No. The University of Chicago Press published the first 10 volumes, then the University of Virginia Press took over.
Washington	Yes. Univ. of Virginia Press / Rotunda.

8 Have there been any issues about publishing production?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	There were some problems in producing volumes in a timely fashion between 1990 and 2002. After a reorganization of the staff and the work process, the last seven volumes have been published on schedule and the next two are in the pipeline for early 2010 and 2011.
Franklin	Production has been steady over the life of the project. Staffing shortages in the last decade have slowed the recent production pace, as senior editors retired or relocated and inexperienced editors were hired to replace them. Training for the newer editors is ongoing. Once the final vacancies are filled the project expects to increase the production rate.
Jefferson Papers	At the moment, all is fine.
Jefferson Retirement	One volume, when the Press changed typesetters, there were some problems, but all is back on track now.
Madison	Not really – some changes in the contract over time.
Washington	Not really.

9 Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	No.
Franklin	No.
Jefferson Papers	No.
Jefferson Retirement	No.
Madison	\$45,000
Washington	\$49,000

10 Do you get a subvention fee? How much?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Subvention fee is offered by NHPRC, but in most instances Harvard University Press does not request support, as most production work is completed by Adams Papers staff.
Franklin	Pew gave \$15,000 per volume for vols. 36-40. NHPRC has not provided a subvention fee since vol 35.

Jefferson Papers	Not from NHPRC or any other agency.
Jefferson Retirement	No.
Madison	Yes, the Press receives a \$10,000 fee per volume.
Washington	Press gets \$10,000 per volume.

11 What volumes are currently in production?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The Adams Family series has vol 10 in process; John Adams Papers, vol 15 is in production, and vol. 16 is in process.
Franklin	Vols. 40/ 41/ 42/ 43.
Jefferson Papers	Volume 36 is published, volume 37 is in Press, and Volume 38 will be submitted by the end of 2010. Volume 39 is in progress.
Jefferson Retirement	Vol. 6 just published. Vol. 7&8 in process.
Madison	Secretary of State series vol. 9 is next to go to press. Presidential Series vol. 7 and Retirement series vol. 2 are in process.
Washington	Revolutionary War series: volumes 19 & 20 are at the press; volumes 21 & 22 are underway. In Presidential series, no volumes are at the press; volumes 16 & 17 are underway.

12 Are you able to meet your target deadlines?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They do now (not so in the past).
Franklin	Production has been steady, historically. Staffing shortages have caused delays in the recent volumes.
Jefferson Papers	Yes, because of experienced, long-time staff.
Jefferson Retirement	Yes.
Madison	Mostly. We try to set them 2 years ahead.
Washington	As a general rule, yes. Their usual target is the production of two volumes each year. That goal is met when four editors are producing a volume every 24 months. The 24 months is extended in two cases: a first solo volume, and a first XML volume. In both cases editors are given an additional 3 months. Production can also be delayed when an editor departs the project with no warning or when we are unable to hire a replacement two years in advance of an anticipated departure. In either of the latter cases production will be slowed as a new editor is trained.

13 If not, what would help you accomplish that?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	We do meet, and frequently beat our deadlines. Pew approached them asking what it would take to speed production, and they responded with a proposal, indicating that another \$700k (initially) per year could provide them with funds which would allow the streamlining of the production process, and doubling of the output.
Franklin	Stable staff.
Jefferson Papers	We do meet them.
Jefferson Retirement	We do meet them.
Madison	We don't always know the Press schedule.
Washington	Advanced notice of editors leaving the project. We do not anticipate that PubMan will speed up our work – on the contrary the PubMan indexing is very likely to prolong the work on a volume by a month – possibly more. Editing in PubMan does not let us work faster, but it may allow us to work better.

37 Who controls your collection?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	They have three levels of documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Adams Family Papers which belong to MHS, and were gifted to them in 1954 (pink & white control file slips – the white represents those that are bound in the letterbooks). 2. Adams documents that are in other MHS collections. 3. Documents acquired over the years from other sources – usually they have copies of these in a variety of copy-formats. (yellow control file slips). Documents they know about, but do not have and are not able to acquire are listed in the control file on blue slips.
Franklin	Yale University and the American Philosophical Society jointly. The project is run by an Administrative Board representative of both organizations.
Jefferson Papers	Princeton University (History Dept).
Jefferson Retirement	Thomas Jefferson Foundation has full editorial and financial responsibility. Princeton University Press makes all publishing decisions.
Madison	The Editorial project. Our work files are in the Rare Books Dept of UVA library.
Washington	Belongs to the project – all copies.

38 Who will make decisions?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	All major decisions about edition are made by the Editor-in-Chief, who is the project manager.
Franklin	The Board.
Jefferson Papers	Barbara Oberg (Editor-in-Chief).
Jefferson Retirement	Jeff Looney (Editor-in-Chief).
Madison	John Stagg (Editor-in-Chief).
Washington	Ted Crackel (Editor-in-Chief).

39

What is your timeframe?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	The project produces one volume per year, alternating between the Papers of John Adams and Adams Family Correspondence volumes. The staff has complete control of all aspects of the publication workflow, up to and including the creation of galley proofs. With this system and the amount of material to be edited and published, 34 years as of 2009 until completion.
Franklin	At current publication rate, project may take in 16 years, but project predicts completion in 2021.
Jefferson Papers	Complete in 17 years.
Jefferson Retirement	Complete in 2027 (18 years).
Madison	20 years to completion.
Washington	Completion target date is 2023.

40

Do you have a budget for this project? How much?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Their budget is about \$700,000 per year.
Franklin	\$650,000 direct costs and \$22,500 indirect costs for current FY. All other indirect costs are absorbed by Yale University.
Jefferson Papers	Approx. \$850,000 per year. Princeton takes no indirect costs.
Jefferson Retirement	\$850,000 per year.
Madison	Approximately \$500,000 per year.
Washington	\$933,000 (annual).

41

Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	NHPRC provides between 20 -25%, NEH provides 25%+ and the balance comes from private sources, principally Packard and Florence Gould. The MHS supplies generous office space and assumes most indirect costs.
Franklin	In addition to funding from NHPRC, Yale University provides office space and some funding. The American Philosophical Society contributes annually. This spring the NEH awarded the project a three-year, \$450,000 grant. The project has received funding from numerous other sources including the Packard Humanities Institute, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Barkley Fund, the Florence Gould Foundation, the Yale Class of 1954 Fund, and private individuals.
Jefferson Papers	In addition to NHPRC funding, Princeton University provides office space, library resources, administrative support, computer services, and Internet access. Princeton University Press publishes the Jefferson Papers volumes without subvention assistance from the NHPRC. In 2007, the NEH awarded the project a three-year We-the-People grant of \$400,000. The project has also received financial assistance from other funders, including the New York Times Company, the Ford Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the Packard Humanities Institute, the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Florence Gould Foundation, and individual Princeton alumni.
Jefferson Retirement	Thomas Jefferson Foundation. By agreement, they cannot compete with the Thomas Jefferson Papers project, which resides at Princeton, so they do not apply for NEH or NHPRC funding. Pew did support the project for the first 6 years.
Madison	NEH, NHPRC, Packard, and private supporters.
Washington	The project is supported by the University, the Packard Humanities Institute, the Mount Vernon

	Ladies Association, and the Save America's Treasures Program. In 2007, NEH awarded the project a three-year \$450,000 We the People grant. NHPRC funds the project at approx \$173,000 per year. – [Note: the university takes 51% of their NEH money (\$150K) as indirect costs, and also charges them \$1000.mo for phone services].
--	--

42 Who is the project manager?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	C. James Taylor
Franklin	Ellen Cohn
Jefferson Papers	Barbara Oberg
Jefferson Retirement	Jeff Looney
Madison	John Stagg
Washington	Ted Crackle

43 How big is your staff? FT? PT?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	There are 12 people on the Adams Papers staff. Two work exclusively on a privately funded project. Two (one part time) work largely on the NHPRC-funded file conversion project. There is a core staff of 7 full-time editors.
Franklin	6 in all: 1 Editor, 1 Assoc., 3 Asst. Editors, 1 Editorial Assist. [note – The project is currently trying to replace a Senior Associate Editor who retired and an Assistant Editor.
Jefferson Papers	7 FTE, including Oberg.
Jefferson Retirement	10 total, of whom one is 3/5 time. (so 9.6 FTE). Editor-in-Chief, Managing Editor, Digital Team – 2 people/ Two Editorial teams, 2 each/ plus 2 editorial assistants.
Madison	3 FT editors, 1 copy editor, 2 research assistants, and ½ office manager. 6.5 total.
Washington	9.5 FTE: 6 editors, 1 copy editor, and half-time assistant, and 2 FTE grad students.

44 If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	"I would probably do what Jeff Looney did..." That is, to begin editing volumes employing a single source encoding system that would prepare text for both print and digital publication. The system we have developed for all of the other aspects of the edition works well.
Franklin	If the project were just beginning and planning to create electronic and letterpress volumes simultaneously, they would tailor their software appropriately. Given how close they are to completion, the fact that their in-house processes are automated, and that the Press does page makeup for them, the current methodologies are the most appropriate ones.
Jefferson Papers	Julian Boyd used the latest technology available to him—microcopy, or, photocopy—and we continue to look for the latest technology possible—now, PubMan and XML tagging.
Jefferson Retirement	Did have control.
Madison	Yes.
Washington	If Ted had begun from scratch he would have made the mistake of collaborative organization. But he inherited the current system of one volume/one editor, and he feels it was brilliant. Much more efficient. Any changes he wants to make will be done in the digital edition.

Projects in action

Information here shows how each project has been used for scholarship and communication with the public.

45 Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	Yes, papers and presentations have been given by the staff on numerous occasions.
Franklin	Yes.
Jefferson Papers	Yes, we have all made presentations, especially at SHEAR (Society for Historians of the Early American Republic).
Jefferson Retirement	Yes, they are very active. 2 or 3 presentations or papers per year.
Madison	Answers to all the questions in this section can be found in their interim reports to the NHPRC; that includes publications and talks that they have made, TV and film programs that they've been consultants to, committees the editors sat on, as well as publications that have used the PJM volume.
Washington	Yes.

46 Have they published papers? Where?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	An extensive list of all those supporting works can be found at this site: http://www.masshist.org/adams/
Franklin	Numerous scholarly papers, essays, and several books. Listed in cv's of personnel in applications to the NHPRC.
Jefferson Papers	Numerous. Complete bibliography is available on request from the project. The information is also available in the c.v.'s of staff members submitted with our applications to the NHPRC.
Jefferson Retirement	Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Magazine of Albemarle County History, Dictionary of Virginia Biography.
Madison	See above, query 45.
Washington	Yes, and dozens of books.

47 Has your collection been used to create resources for K-12 teaching? Films/television? Exhibitions? Websites?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	We share our files and early transcriptions with scholars and graduate students. During the last year we supplied material and/or entertained in our office numerous scholars including Woody Holton, Joseph Ellis, Randall Woods, and Gordon Wood.
Franklin	In print: Have provided in-depth assistance to countless biographers, scholars, popular writers, and authors of books for children and young adults, in U.S., France, Italy, Germany, and Czechoslovakia. Documentaries: 4 major television documentaries (including Emmy-award winning doc. on PBS) were done for BF 300th birthday in 2006. Project editors appeared as on-air experts, provided research assistance, vetted PBS final cut. Exhibitions: Major traveling exhibition in 2006, at 300th anniversary, with countless spin-offs and other exhibits that continue to tour libraries and museums in U.S. and abroad. Websites: Many. Besides websites devoted to Franklin in general, project materials have been used for countless websites on topics reflecting Franklin's interests and contributions, including a

	<p>website of the Independence National Park on Philadelphia history, a NASA website for children on the Gulf Stream, several websites on 18th century music and on the glass harmonica (an instrument Franklin invented), a comprehensive website on the history and development of eyeglasses, etc.</p> <p>Musical compositions: project gave substantial research assistance on Franklin and music to award-winning composer Daniel Kellogg for his orchestral piece commissioned by the Philadelphia Orchestra, 2006.</p>
Jefferson Papers	<p>We invite a group of AP students and their teachers to come to project every year. We show them around and do a seminar kind of class with them, breaking them into groups and using a packet of documents that we put together specifically for them.</p> <p>Almost any TV program on the Founders uses TJ Papers as a source.</p> <p>We have not participated in the creation of Exhibitions.</p> <p>A lot of questions come into the TJ Papers website. They are answered, but no log is kept [we have an informal sense of the questions that come in].</p>
Jefferson Retirement	The Thomas Jefferson Foundation handles most of this.
Madison	See above. They do not target K-12 education specifically, but the website helps.
Washington	

48 Do you keep a citation list?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	An extensive list of all those supporting works can be found at this site: http://www.masshist.org/adams/
Franklin	Citation list on file.
Jefferson Papers	Available on request.
Jefferson Retirement	The Thomas Jefferson Foundation handles most of this.
Madison	Yes.
Washington	No.

49 Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?

<i>Project</i>	<i>Answer</i>
Adams	An extensive list of all those supporting works can be found at this site: http://www.masshist.org/adams/
Franklin	Reports on uses submitted in previous NHPRC reports. Selective bibliographies of new work on Franklin, both scholarly and popular, that makes use of this edition are submitted in applications to the NEH.
Jefferson Papers	See answers above.
Jefferson Retirement	The Thomas Jefferson Foundation handles most of this.
Madison	See above.
Washington	No.

Appendix B – Full answers to questionnaires by each project (not normalized or edited)

	Project Questionnaire	The Adams Papers	In process	In process
		General	Adams Family	Papers of John Adams
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>			
1	How many volumes have been printed?	The Adams Papers edition has 42 volumes in print. Series One: Diaries includes John Adams Diaries and Autobiography, 5 volumes; and John Quincy Adams Diaries, 2 volumes to date; Charles Francis Adams Diaries, 8 volumes to date. Series Two: Adams Family Correspondence (AFC)--9 volumes to date, with the next to appear in early 2011. Series Three: General Correspondence and other Papers of the Adams Statesmen--3 volumes of the Legal Papers of John Adams; and 14 volumes of the Papers of John Adams (PJA). Volume 15 will appear in March or April 2010. Series Four: Portraits 2 volumes (of John and Abigail and of John Quincy and "his wife."	9	14
2	How many additional volumes are planned?		11	23
3	What is the frequency of publication?	Founders era volumes one per year (alternating series)		
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?	Avg. 500 /vol.	Est. 5400 total	Est. 8400 total
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?	285		
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	Est. 20-25% annotation		
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	Yes, Harvard University Press.		
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	There were some problems in producing volumes in a timely fashion between 1990 and 2002. After a reorganization of the staff and the work process, the last seven volumes have been published on schedule and the next two are in the pipeline for early 2010 and 2011.		
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	no		
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	Subvention fee is offered by NHPRC, but in most instances HUP does not request support, as most production work is completed by Adams Papers staff.		
11	What volumes are currently in production?	AFC vol 10 in process; PJA vol. 15 in production, vol. 16 in process.	Vol 10 in process	Vol 15 in production, vol 16 in process
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	They do now (not so in the past).		
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	We do meet, and frequently beat our deadlines. Pew approached them asking what it would take to speed production, and they responded with a proposal, indicating that another \$700k (initially) per year could provide them with funds which would allow the streamlining of the production process, and doubling of the output.		
	<i>Collection description</i>			

14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?		family	One person, incoming and outgoing
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	They still need to gather executive era documents from the National Archives and the Library of Congress. This process will probably take about two years, with a researcher spending two weeks each year on-site to locate the documents. Anticipated number: 500 – 1500 documents.		
16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized? (OMIT??)	Transcription is mostly complete up to 1813. Foreign language documents are transcribed and translated more slowly because work is done by experts we consult in the particular languages. Some enclosures or other related third party documents that will not be printed have not been transcribed. Transcriptions are done well in advance of the volumes in production. Transcriptions for PJA are currently done through the next three volumes	Mostly collected Transcribed through 1808?	Mostly collected (except as above).
16 A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	There are approximately 12,900 additional Adams documents from which selection will be made for the remaining volumes.		
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	They will exclude most receipts and forms that have merely a signature. For example when John Adams is president there will be routine documents such as commissions that he signs. These are too numerous and, unless of specific interest, would not be printed.		
18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	Most of the documents are original manuscripts held by the MHS. Some, about 30%, have been acquired from other institutions and individuals. The non MHS materials are held as photocopies.		
	manuscripts			
	Printed material			
	Xerox copies			
	Old carbon copies			
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles			
	Audio tapes/discs			
	Video (format?)			
	WORKFLOW – described separately			
	<i>Technology status</i>			
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	Transcription is mostly complete up to 1813.		
20	What format?	Word		
21	Has it been proofread?	They do not start verification to publication standards until the documents have been selected for a volume.		
22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, organizations?	The office maintains an extensive genealogical name file, bibliography, and directory of residences for editorial production uses. Otherwise the extensive index in each volume offers a controlled glossary of people, places titles and organizations.		
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	The office currently has an extensive genealogical name file (paper) and the digital cumulative index provides the full name (and life dates when possible) that has been indexed in a volume. The control file digitization project is currently building a supporting database of all Adams correspondents that will link to the main control file database and will include the full		

		name (life dates and titles when possible) of all person who appear in the control file.		
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	The intellectual control of the project resides in the control file. This file has been fully digitized and is currently being encoded in a custom-designed XML schema. It will be ready for editorial and public use by January 2011. The book production process uses a custom-designed template in MS Word, created by the typesetter, TnT. We use the template through all phases of book production and retain control of the files until the final page proofs. The office currently uses MS Word and Excel to manage workflow and track progress. Cindex is used for indexing.		
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	Building on the work of the Adams Papers, the MHS has digitized the full correspondence between John and Abigail Adams (images and transcripts), the complete John Adams Diaries and Autobiography (images and transcripts) and the complete John Quincy Adams Diaries (15,000 pages of images).		
26	If so, what format / standards?	These are all XML files and are run through XSL style sheets.		
27	What percentage is scanned?			
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?			
29	What standards/format?			
30	How much is complete?			
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Online with Rotunda and MHS		
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	Rotunda		
33	What is the status of that goal?	30 volumes now online.		
34	If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	"The last report concerning the Adams Papers online at the MHS website was for the month of September 2009. The following is copied from the report supplied by the MHS: 'For Sept 2009, the Founding Families section of the website received 2,300 total visits, and 1,402 unique visitors. Those visitors viewed an average of 43 pages each, or a total of about 100,000 pages total (as opposed to about 9 pages each for all visitors to the website in general), and stayed an average of about 15 minutes each visit (as opposed to 2 mins, 22 sec for all visitors.)' The MHS considers this a great success."		
35	If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	No reports from Rotunda yet, but for MHS free access see reply to #34 above.		
36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	Yes – MHS for free		
	<i>Administration issues</i>			
37	Who controls your collection?	They have three levels of documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Adams Family Papers which belong to MHS, and were gifted to them in 1954 (pink & white control file slips – the white represents those that are bound in the letterbooks) 2. Adams documents that are in other MHS collections 3. Documents acquired over the years from other sources – usually they have copies of these in a variety of copy-formats. 		

		(yellow control file slips) Documents they know about, but do not have and are unable to acquire are listed in the control file on blue slips.		
38	Who will make decisions?	All major decisions about edition are made by the Editor-in-Chief , who is the project manager.		
39	What is your timeframe?	The project produces one volume per year, alternating between PJA and AFC volumes. The staff has complete control of all aspects of the publication workflow, up to and including the creation of galley proofs. With this system and the amount of material to be edited and published, 34 years as of 2009 until completion.		
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	Their budget is about \$700k per year.		
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	NHPRC provides between 20 -25%, NEH provides 25%+ and the balance comes from private sources, principally Packard and Florence Gould. The MHS supplies generous office space and assumes most indirect costs.		
42	Who is the project manager?	C. James Taylor		
43	How big is your staff? FT?PT?students? volunteers? Already hired?	There are 12 people on the Adams Papers staff. Two work exclusively on a privately-funded project. Two (one part time) work largely on the NHPRC-funded file conversion project. There is a core staff of seven full-time editors.		
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	"I would probably do what Jeff Looney did..." That is, to begin editing volumes employing a single source encoding system that would prepare text for both print and digital publication. The system we have developed for all of the other aspects of the edition works well.		
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>			
45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	Yes, papers and presentations have been given by the staff on numerous occasions.		
46	Have they published papers? Where?	An extensive list of all those supporting works can be found at this site: http://www.masshist.org/adams/		
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:	We share our files and early transcriptions with scholars and graduate students. During the last year we supplied material and/or entertained in our office numerous scholars including Woody Holton, Joseph Ellis, Randall Woods, and Gordon Wood.		
	K-12 teaching support			
	Films/ television programs			
	Exhibitions			
	Websites			
48	Do you keep a citation list?			
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?			

	Project Questionnaire	Papers of Benjamin Franklin
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>	
1	How many volumes have been printed?	39
2	How many additional volumes are planned?	8
3	What is the frequency of publication?	1 vol every 2 years (but working toward a 1 vol/yr target)
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?	Average is 790/ vol. Vol 36: 770 p; Vol 37: 820 p; Vol 38, 690 p; Vol 39: 675 p
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?	640
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	Not sure
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	Yes, Yale University Press
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	Production has been steady over the life of the project. Staffing shortages in the last decade have slowed the recent production pace, as senior editors retired or relocated and inexperienced editors were hired to replace them. Training for the newer editors is ongoing. Once the final vacancies are filled the project expects to increase the production rate.
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	no
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	Pew gave \$15,000 per volume for vols. 36-40. NHPRC has not provided a subvention fee since vol 35.
11	What volumes are currently in production?	Vols. 40/ 41/ 42/ 43
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	Production has been steady, historically. Staffing shortages have caused delays in the recent volumes.
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	Stable staff
	<i>Collection description</i>	
14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?	Almost all are Benjamin Franklin. Some letters of his grandson, William Temple Franklin.
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	None. If anything is uncovered, it is acquired immediately.
16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized? (OMIT??)	The digital edition (created by the Packard Humanities Institute) includes texts of the published papers and unverified, rough transcriptions of the as-yet-unpublished material.
16 A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	5300
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	They exclude lengthy enclosures, routine signed forms, most third-party documents, and incoming letters that repeat previous appeals.
18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	
	manuscripts	
	Printed material	
	Xerox copies	30,000 documents
	Old carbon copies	
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles	
	Audio tapes/discs	
	Video (format?)	
	WORKFLOW – described separately	

	<i>Technology status</i>	
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	All of it. Transcriptions of everything that will be published in future volumes are online. Most of the remainder (enclosures, etc.) is also online. The Packard Humanities Institute maintains and updates the database as volumes are published.
20	What format?	They sent typescripts (most from the 1950s) to be keyed by vendors in 1988. The original keyed documents were made available on CD-ROMs. The switch to web access was made in 2006. Format appears to be XML compatible, but this is not verified as yet.
21	Has it been proofread?	The documents which are unpublished have not been proofed.
22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, organizations?	The Digital Franklin Papers is a complete record of every document. It includes a Master Index of Names, created by the project, which takes into account all variant forms. It also contains biographical sketches of nearly all correspondents. All letters written to/by any individual or organization can be sorted independently. In addition, the project has completed the first draft of a cumulative index, which creates an authority file. Individual volume indexes are currently searchable on the project's website; the draft cumulative index will soon be available on the website. The Packard Humanities Institute makes all changes to datelines and title lines as well as texts, as each volume is published, relocating documents as necessary and revising index of proper names.
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	See above. Digital Edition includes a Master Names Index.
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	They create a flowchart using Excel to keep track of all tasks for each document, volume by volume. Flowcharts are already created for all future volumes. Transcriptions of all unpublished documents, digitized by Packard and available on the website, are downloaded for editors' use onto our PCs and are the basis of what we submit to the Press. All control file information was also digitized by Packard and is available on the CD-ROM and on editors' PCs. Editors use a shared folder on university computer network to share annotation, research notes, style guide, PDFs of previous volumes, indexes, etc. Project uses WordPerfect, submits WordPerfect files to Yale University Press. Doesn't put docs into XML.
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	
26	If so, what format / standards?	
27	What percentage is scanned?	
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCREd?	Nearly all is keyed; not all proofread.
29	What standards/format?	Will need to consult Packard.
30	How much is complete?	All of it. Transcriptions of everything that will be published in future volumes are online. Most of what we will not publish (enclosures, third-party documents, etc.) is also online, so that users of the letterpress edition can read full texts.
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Yes, available online through the Packard Humanities Institute.
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	None other than the Packard Humanities Institute. They have been approached by Rotunda, but Board has not yet agreed.
33	What is the status of that goal?	All published and unpublished documents currently online, with free access.
34	If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	Free online, highly successful. Page views last monitored in September, 2007, when site was visited 13,230 times by users in 154 countries around the globe. Page views totaled over 94,000. In 2009 Packard Humanities Institute made available the "metadata" to Stanford University graduate students participating in the "Digging Into the Enlightenment: Mapping the Republic of Letters" project, recipient of a "Digging Into Data" challenge grant from the NEH.
35	If your project is available online from	Currently one source only

	more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	
36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	Already provided. A digital version of the Franklin Papers, created and maintained by the Packard Humanities Institute
	<i>Administration issues</i>	
37	Who controls your collection?	Yale University and the American Philosophical Society jointly. The project is run by an Administrative Board representative of both organizations.
38	Who will make decisions?	The Board.
39	What is your timeframe?	At current publication rate, project will be complete in 16 years. Possibly earlier.
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	\$650,000 direct costs and \$22,500 indirect costs for current FY. All other indirect costs are absorbed by Yale University.
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	In addition to funding from NHPRC, Yale University provides office space and some funding. The American Philosophical Society contributes annually. This spring the NEH awarded the project a three-year, \$450,000 grant. The project has received funding from numerous other sources including the Packard Humanities Institute, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Barkley Fund, the Florence Gould Foundation, the Yale Class of 1954 Fund, and private individuals.
42	Who is the project manager?	Ellen Cohn
43	How big is your staff? FT?PT?students? volunteers? Already hired?	6 in all: 1 Editor, 1 Assoc., 3 Asst. Editors, 1 Editorial Asst. The project is currently trying to replace a Senior Associate Editor who retired and an Assistant Editor.
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	If the project were just beginning and planning to create electronic and letterpress volumes simultaneously, they would tailor their software appropriately. Given how close they are to completion, the fact that their in-house processes are automated, and that the Press does page makeup for them, the current methodologies are the most appropriate ones.
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>	
45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	yes
46	Have they published papers? Where?	Numerous scholarly papers, essays, and several books. Listed in cv's of personnel in applications to the NHPRC.
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:	In print: Have provided in-depth assistance to countless biographers, scholars, popular writers, and authors of books for children and young adults, in U.S., France, Italy, Germany, and Czechoslovakia. Musical compositions: project gave substantial research assistance on Franklin and music to award-winning composer Daniel Kellogg for his orchestral piece commissioned by the Philadelphia Orchestra, 2006.
	K-12 teaching support	No – but we have assisted in writing books for children.
	Films/ television programs	Documentaries: 4 major television documentaries (including Emmy-award winning doc. on PBS) were done for BF 300th birthday in 2006. Project editors appeared as on-air experts, provided research assistance, vetted PBS final cut.
	Exhibitions	Exhibitions: Major traveling exhibition in 2006, at 300th anniversary, with countless spin-offs and other exhibits that continue to tour libraries and museums in U.S. and abroad.
	Websites	Websites: Many. Besides websites devoted to Franklin in general, project materials have been used for countless websites on topics reflecting Franklin's interests and contributions, including a website of the Independence National Park on Philadelphia history, a NASA website for children on the Gulf Stream, several websites on 18th

		century music and on the glass harmonica (an instrument Franklin invented), a comprehensive website on the history and development of eyeglasses, etc.
48	Do you keep a citation list?	Citation list on file.
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?	Reports on uses submitted in previous NHPRC reports. Selective bibliographies of new work on Franklin, both scholarly and popular, that makes use of this edition are submitted in applications to the NEH.

	Project Questionnaire	Papers of Thomas Jefferson
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>	
1	How many volumes have been printed?	41 in all. 4 volumes of the Presidential series, still in process, have been published. The Pre-presidential series is complete, in 32 volumes, and the Topical Series comprises 4 titles (5 volumes) to date.
2	How many additional volumes are planned?	17 [note- there is a "Topical Series" being done by outside editors]
3	What is the frequency of publication?	1 vol / yr
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?	The volumes have ranged from approx. 400 to 800 pages, including index and front matter
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?	Between 550-600 documents per volume. Some are summaries, as opposed to full docs.
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	Estimate 20-25% is annotation
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	Yes, Princeton University Press
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	At the moment, all is fine
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	no
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	Not from NHPRC or any other agency
11	What volumes are currently in production?	Volume 36 is published, volume 37 is in Press, and Volume 38 will be submitted by the end of 2010. Volume 39 is in progress.
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	Yes, because of experienced, long-time staff
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	
	<i>Collection description</i>	
14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?	Thomas Jefferson
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	Almost none. Docs are acquired immediately when new items are discovered.
16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized?	Virtually all are transcribed
16 A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	Est. 10,800
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	In general, third party documents are not published, sometimes legal and court decisions are not. Decisions made on a case-by-case basis. The original selection statement: "We consider for publication as we are doing the selection for each volume, all letters to and from Thomas Jefferson, and all documents in his hand." Not all documents are published in full, but all but the very routine are taken account of.

18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	
	manuscripts	
	Printed material	Occasional newspaper article
	Xerox copies	All are photocopies – 70,000 documents, some of which are variant texts or third party documents used for annotation
	Old carbon copies	
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles	
	Audio tapes/discs	
	Video (format?)	
	WORKFLOW – described separately	
	<i>Technology status</i>	
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	Almost transcriptions have been keyed; only the occasional newly found document needs keying.
20	What format?	Originally the documents were typed. Then PHI had them converted to HTML. We worked with them in Word in recent years, and Dataformat is now converting them to XML for edit in Xmetal.
21	Has it been proofread?	At least three, and possibly as many as eight, volumes ahead of where the editors are working have had a first verification.
22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, and organizations?	Not as such, but the ongoing cumulative index serves that purpose.
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	See above. For our day-to-day work, the most authoritative version of a name is the one in the most recent volume's index.
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	In order to assist its work, the project has transferred the information from its document control slips to a database, which was created in Microsoft Access. This is used to note which documents are allocated to which editor, and whether the document is printed in full, summarized, or described in annotation. The project installed the PubMan content management system, which became operational earlier this year. The XMetaL software associated with this system enables the editors to encode texts suitable for both book and online publication.
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	We purchase scans of materials from the repositories when needed to assist with a better reading of the manuscript.
26	If so, what format / standards?	
27	What percentage is scanned?	A small percentage
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?	Material has been systematically double keyboarded through the Packard Humanities Institute
29	What standards/format?	
30	How much is complete?	See above
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Yes
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	Yes, Rotunda.
33	What is the status of that goal?	A beta version was made available on April 13, 2009(Jefferson's birthday). The cumulative index and indices to Vols. 22-33, will very soon be up and available along with the volumes.
34	If your project it already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	Rotunda has a non-exclusive agreement with PUP. Rotunda has converted 33 volumes and incorporated them into their Founding Era Collection online publications. A good review is just out in Library Journal.

35	If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	PHI does plan to make the documents available (as they did with the Franklin Papers) but we don't know what the timeframe is.
36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	The PHI version would be free.
	<i>Administration issues</i>	
37	Who controls your collection?	Princeton University (history dept)
38	Who will make decisions?	Barbara Oberg, Editor
39	What is your timeframe?	Complete in 17 years
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	Approx. \$850K per year. Princeton takes no indirect costs.
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	In addition to NHPRC funding, Princeton University provides office space, library resources, administrative support, computer services, and Internet access. Princeton University Press publishes the Jefferson Papers volumes without subvention assistance from the NHPRC. In 2007, the NEH awarded the project a three-year We-the-People grant of \$400,000. The project has also received financial assistance from other funders, including the New York Times Company, the Ford Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the Packard Humanities Institute, the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Florence Gould Foundation, and individual Princeton alumni.
42	Who is the project manager?	Barbara Oberg, Editor
43	How big is your staff? FT?PT?	7 FTE, including Oberg
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	Julian Boyd used the latest technology available to him—microcopy, or, photocopy—and we continue to look for the latest technology possible—now, PubMan and XML tagging.
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>	
45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	Yes, we have all made presentations, especially at SHEAR (Society for Historians of the Early American Republic).
46	Have they published papers? Where?	Numerous. Complete bibliography is available on request from the project. The information is also available in the c.v.'s of staff members submitted with our applications to the NHPRC.
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:	
	K-12 teaching support	We invite a group of AP students and their teachers to come to project every year. We show them around and do a seminar kind of class with them, breaking them into groups and using a packet of documents that we put together specifically for them.
	Films/ television programs	Almost any TV program on the Founders uses TJ Papers as a source
	Exhibitions	No
	Websites	A lot of questions come into the TJPapers website. They are answered, but no log is kept.[we have an informal sense of the questions that come in]
48	Do you keep a citation list?	
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?	

	Project Questionnaire	Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>	
1	How many volumes have been printed?	5
2	How many additional volumes are planned?	17
3	What is the frequency of publication?	1 vol / yr
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?	775
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?	560
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	Their goal is to keep the annotation "lean and mean" – not excessive. Probably 80/20?
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	Yes. Princeton University Press
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	One volume, when the Press changed typesetters, there were some problems, but all is back on track now.
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	no
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	no
11	What volumes are currently in production?	Vol 6 is just published. Vol. 7&8 in process
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	yes
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	
	<i>Collection description</i>	
14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?	Documents to and from Thomas Jefferson. A substantial collection of family letters has also been accessioned.
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	Nothing that they are aware of to or from Jefferson. Family documents are still being collected.
16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized? (OMIT??)	They had microfilm originally. This was printed out to paper using copyflow processing. They have 15-20K documents accessioned. All docs were keyed by vendors when they began the project, so even the unpublished documents have been keyed. However, the files are very rough, and require considerable editing and clean up. They have 2 people assigned to that task. Currently on 1823 in the clean-up process (project covers 1809-1826). All checked docs are in their CMS, as is control file metadata, for documents, which are not yet checked.
16A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	Roughly 10,000
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	Only things they have omitted are items being held for the "Second Series," and some groupings of family and University of Virginia documents collected for annotation and context.
18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	Almost everything is keyed
	manuscripts	

	Printed material	
	Xerox copies	Mostly microfilm printed using copyflow, supplemented in many cases by newer digital images of the same documents.
	Old carbon copies	
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles	
	Audio tapes/discs	
	Video (format?)	
	WORKFLOW – described separately	
	<i>Technology status</i>	
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	Most has been keyed by Apex, but unpublished still need considerable clean-up.
20	What format?	XML
21	Has it been proofread?	Most unpublished docs have been cleaned up to some extent, but none proofed against originals.
22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, and organizations?	We have in PubMan a title for places and for people – trying to standardize.
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	Yes, as above
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	PubMan CMS XMetal for editing All control file information has been loaded to the CMS Digital images of many documents have been linked to the database.
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	They are making arrangements to acquire scans of originals from major sources. They already have a large number, taken from 9 biggest repositories, loaded into their CMS. They are for internal editorial use only.
26	If so, what format / standards?	In most cases they acquired 300-dpi or better jpegs, combined the images for each text in a PDF, added repository information and control numbers, and linked it to their database.
27	What percentage is scanned?	Of the overall corpus, this is 80%.
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?	Yes - Apex
29	What standards/format?	They started with MEP tags, modified them to suit their style. They are not fully TEI compliant at this point, although they expect to work with a consultant to achieve full TEI compliance in the future.
30	How much is complete?	all
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Yes
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	Rotunda will publish vols 1-4 at the end of this year.
33	What is the status of that goal?	Vols 1-4 In process
34	If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	Too soon to tell.
35	If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	NA

36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	Not currently planning to make files available for free, as this would undercut the Rotunda product.
	<i>Administration issues</i>	
37	Who controls your collection?	Thomas Jefferson Foundation has full editorial and financial responsibility. PUP makes all publishing decisions
38	Who will make decisions?	Jeff Looney (Editor-in-Chief)
39	What is your timeframe?	Complete in 2027 (18 yrs)
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	\$850,000 / yr
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	Thomas Jefferson Foundation. By agreement, they cannot compete with the Thomas Jefferson Papers project, which resides at Princeton, so they do not apply for NEH or NHPRC funding. Pew did support the project for the first 6 years.
42	Who is the project manager?	Jeff Looney
43	How big is your staff?	10 total, of whom one is 3/5 time. (so 9.6 FTE) Editor-in-Chief, Managing Editor, Digital Team – 2 people/ Two Editorial teams, 2 each/ plus 2 editorial assistants
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	Did have control.
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>	
45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	Yes, they are very active. 2 or 3 presentations or papers per year
46	Have they published papers? Where?	Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Magazine of Albemarle County History, Dictionary of Virginia Biography.
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:	TJ Foundation handles most of these:
	K-12 teaching support	
	Films/ television programs	
	Exhibitions	
	Websites	
48	Do you keep a citation list?	
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?	

	Project Questionnaire	Papers of James Madison
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>	
1	How many volumes have been printed?	Total: 32 Congressional Series: 17 Presidential Series: 6 Secretary-of-State Series: 8 Retirement Series: 1
2	How many additional volumes are planned?	Total: 19 Congressional Series: 0 (complete) Presidential Series: 5 Secretary-of-State Series: 8+ Retirement Series: 6
3	What is the frequency of publication?	1 vol. / yr
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?	Approximately 600 – 800 pages per volume in Presidential and Secretary-of-State Series
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?	Up to 600 docs/vol – perhaps 400 in full, and 200 summarized
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	15-20% is annotation
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	No. The University of Chicago Press published the first 10 volumes, then the University of Virginia Press took over the rest.
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	Not really – some changes in the contract over time.
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	\$45,000
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	Yes, the Press receives a \$10,000 fee/vol.
11	What volumes are currently in production?	Secy State series vol. 9 is next to go to press. Pres. Series vol 7 and Retirement series vol. 2 are in process
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	Mostly. We try to set them 2 years ahead.
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	We don't always know the Press schedule.
	<i>Collection description</i>	
14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?	James Madison
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	Only enclosures and 3 rd party documents will be acquired. 10-20% for the executive series, but they are on film and so easily accessible.
16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized?	All of the documents in the folders have been transcribed.
16 A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	Total: 11,400 docs. Presidential Series: 3,000 docs. Secretary-of-State Series: 4,800 docs. Retirement Series: 3,600 docs.
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	We have omitted routine documents, land and transmitted docs, enclosures. Some docs are summarized rather than reproduced in full. We include 3 rd party letters if they are relevant to research. We do include books written by JM.
18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	
	manuscripts	
	Printed material	

	Xerox copies	100%
	Old carbon copies	
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles	
	Audio tapes/discs	
	Video (format?)	
	WORKFLOW – described separately	
	<i>Technology status</i>	
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	All of the documents in the folders have been transcribed.
20	What format?	Word
21	Has it been proofread?	no
22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, and organizations?	no
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	No- just the index
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	No intention to use a CMS.
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	
26	If so, what format / standards?	
27	What percentage is scanned?	
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?	All has been keyed.
29	What standards/format?	Word
30	How much is complete?	All
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Yes
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	Yes
33	What is the status of that goal?	Rotunda will have Madison online in the Spring of 2010.
34	If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	NA
35	If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	NA
36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	no
	<i>Administration issues</i>	
37	Who controls your collection?	The Editorial project. Our work files are in the Rare Books Dept of UVA library.
38	Who will make decisions?	John Stagg
39	What is your timeframe?	20 years to completion
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	Approximately \$500,000/yr
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	NEH, NHPRC, Packard, and private supporters
42	Who is the project manager?	John Stagg
43	How big is your staff?	3 FT editors, 1 copy editor, 2 research assistants, and ½ office manager. 6.5 total.
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	Yes.
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>	

45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	Answers to all the questions in this section can be found in their interim reports to the NHPRC; that includes publications and talks that they have made, TV and film programs that they've been consultants to, committees the editors sat on, as well as publications that have used the PJM volume
46	Have they published papers? Where?	
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:	
	K-12 teaching support	Not specifically – but the website helps.
	Films/ television programs	
	Exhibitions	
	Websites	
48	Do you keep a citation list?	Yes.
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?	See above.

	Project Questionnaire	Papers of George Washington general	In process Rev. War series	In process Presidential series
	<i>Status of Project: print</i>			
1	How many volumes have been printed?	61 published in all: 18 of a projected 40 vols in the Rev War + 15 of a projected 21 vols in the Presidential Series.+ diaries and single vol abridgement (7 vols) +colonial series (10 vols) + confederation series (6 vols) + retirement series (4 vols) + proceedings of the presidency (1 vol).	18	15
2	How many additional volumes are planned?	28	22	6
3	What is the frequency of publication?	Usually 2 vols / yr		
4	Already printed: How many pages/vol?		800-900/vol	600-799/vol
5	What is the average number of documents per volume?		700 docs/v	500 docs/v
6	What percentage of printed text is annotation vs. documents?	25-30% is annotation		
7	Have you kept the same publisher from the beginning?	Yes. Univ. of Virginia Press / Rotunda		
8	Have there been any issues about publishing production?	Not really.		
9	Do you know what it costs to produce a printed volume?	\$49,000		
10	Do you get a subvention fee? How much?	Press get \$10,000/vol.		
11	What volumes are currently in production?		Vols 19 & 20 at the press; vols 21 & 22 are underway.	No vols at the press; vols 16 & 17 underway.
12	Are you able to meet your target deadlines?	As a general rule, yes. Their usual target is the production of two volumes each year. That goal is met when four editors are producing a volume every 24 months. The 24 months is extended in two cases: a first solo volume, and a first XML volume. In both cases editors are given an additional 3 months. Production can also be delayed when an editor departs the project with no warning or when we are unable to hire a replacement two years in advance of an anticipated departure. In either of the latter cases production will be slowed as a new editor is trained.		
13	If not, what would help you accomplish that?	Advanced notice of editors leaving the project. We do not anticipate that PubMan will speed up our work – on the contrary the PubMan indexing is very likely to prolong the work on a volume by a month – possibly more. Editing in PubMan does not let us work faster, but it may allow us to work better.		
	<i>Collection description</i>			
14	Does the collection include papers from one person? A family? An organization?	Only correspondence to and from GW (and a few Martha)		
15	What percent of docs have been identified but not acquired?	The only documents identified but not located are those identified in the volumes as “document not found.” In examining three typical volumes that number is about 7%.		

16	What is the status of the unpublished materials? Collected? Processed? Annotated? Digitized? (OMIT??)	Most to be used in volumes have been transcribed (albeit roughly). [Note – Financial series info follows, but this series is not being included in this Report’s analysis: There are over 900 docs in financial series still not transcribed. Some of the latter are multipage account books. The level of XML tagging for these documents will be much more extensive than anything they have heretofore attempted. They could easily represent as many as 5000 pages. And, these documents are in excess of what has already been done in our shop and by the interns, and, further, what has already been done is barebones transcriptions (with a minimum or no XML tagging) and there are likely to be at least 100,000 separate XML entries to be made to these pages.]		
16 A	How many documents remain to be published in printed volumes?	Total: 19,600 docs. (estimate). An unknown number of additional documents– probably several thousand – will be used (all or in part) in annotating the last 29 volumes. This may bring the total to est. 22,000.		
17	Are there any document categories that you have omitted from publication?	They have omitted the financial papers (mentioned above) and the “school papers,” and blank business forms, and the “110 rules of civility” – but all of these ultimately will be included in the digital edition in some form.		
18	Physical description what does your unpublished collection consist of (define percentage of each)	Most are Xerox copies, and rough transcriptions of these. The collection Washington preserved, and documents collected by other archives (letters GW sent to others). About 45% are available as digital images from the Library of Congress.		
	manuscripts			
	Printed material			
	Xerox copies			
	Old carbon copies			
	Typed/printed letters/papers/articles			
	Audio tapes/discs			
	Video (format?)			
	WORKFLOW – described separately			
	<i>Technology status</i>			
19	How much of your unpublished material (the part you intend to include in future publications) has been keyed in machine-readable format?	Most of the unpublished material is keyed but not proofread.		
20	What format?	All transcribed material is now in XML.		
21	Has it been proofread?	None of the documents for volumes not yet underway have been proofread.		

22	Have you created a glossary for people, places, titles, and organizations?	No, but they are currently creating a cumulative index. Once complete, the cumulative index will be updated automatically by PubMan as each new volume index is created.		
23	Do you have a name authority system in place?	No – but they are building one de facto via the cumulative index		
24	What technology are you using to support your editorial process?	PubMan content management system, XMetal text editor –and Oxygen for some purposes.		
25	Has any of your material (mss images) been scanned?	No		
26	If so, what format / standards?			
27	What percentage is scanned?			
28	Has any of your material been keyed? OCRed?	The first 52 volumes were prepared by Apex for Rotunda - XML, TEI p5		
29	What standards/format?	XML, TEI p5		
30	How much is complete?	Work on these 52 volumes by Apex has been completed, but the project is still trying to identify yet undetected errors introduced by Apex in these volumes.		
31	Have you or do you intend to digitize the printed volumes?	Digital files for all volumes after the first 52 are available and all future volumes are being prepared in XML.		
32	Do you have an agreement with an online publisher?	Rotunda		
33	What is the status of that goal?	55 of the printed volumes are now online. 3 more are ready to be placed on line. Others will be placed online about two years after their publication in volumes.		
34	If your project is already available online, has it been successful? Subscriptions sold? Average views?	Approximately 35 standing order subscriptions sold to date.		
35	If your project is available online from more than one source, what are they and how does that work?	All of the documents in the digital edition are available in an online edition from Mt. Vernon – but this version does not include annotations		
36	Do you have plans to provide alternative public access? Free?	Already done		
	<i>Administration issues</i>			
37	Who controls your collection?	Belongs to the project – all copies		
38	Who will make decisions?	Ted Crackel		
39	What is your timeframe?	Completion target date is 2023 (Ted- should it be 2025?)		
40	Do you have a budget for this project? How much?	\$933,000		
41	Do you have a source of funding? From where? How much?	The project is supported by the University, the Packard Humanities Institute, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, and the Save America's Treasures Program. In 2007, NEH awarded the		

		project a three-year \$450,000 We the People grant. NHPRC funds the project at approx \$173,000 per year. – [Note: the university takes 51% of their NEH money (\$150K) as indirect costs, and also charges them \$1000.mo for phone services]		
42	Who is the project manager?	Ted Crackel		
43	How big is your staff?	9.5 FTE		
44	If you had it to do over (had control from the beginning) would you change your approach?	If Ted had begun from scratch he would have made the mistake of collaborative organization. But he inherited the current system of one volume/one editor, and he feels it was brilliant. Much more efficient. Any changes he wants to make will be done in the digital edition.		
	<i>Derivatives: FF Papers in action</i>			
45	Have your staff members made presentations based on your project at conferences?	Yes.		
46	Have they published papers? Where?	Yes, and dozens of books		
47	Has anyone used your collection to create resources for:			
	K-12 teaching support			
	Films/ television programs			
	Exhibitions			
	Websites			
48	Do you keep a citation list?	No		
49	Do you keep a log of the ways in which your project supports users?	No		