From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:03:13 PM):
Hi everyone! Please feel free to send questions via chat! I'm pleased to see so many of you online!

From Rick Fitzgerald to All Participants (02:09:01 PM):
merrilee, could you send the phone-in details again? thanks. our audio is not great on our computer

From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:10:15 PM):
Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada): 1-877-668-4490
Call-in toll number (US/Canada): 1-408-792-6300
Access code: 714 623 168

From OCLC Research to All Participants (02:10:35 PM):
To connect to the audio, dial 1-877-668-4490 and enter event# 714 623 168.

From Lane Rasberry to All Participants (02:13:52 PM):
it was about the integration of women into Princeton - no females allowed before 1967!

From Lane Rasberry to All Participants (02:19:28 PM):
Media donation does link back in a critical way! CC-BY means attribution for all reuse. This matters a lot.

From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:21:18 PM):
Thanks, Lane, that's a great point

From J S to All Participants (02:23:36 PM):
i would be curious to know why max feels the future of research is the model he describes--i.e. web->wikipedia->libraries. why wouldn't people just stop at wikipedia?

From Matt Senate to All Participants (02:24:05 PM):
what was the hashtag?

From Lane Rasberry to All Participants (02:24:12 PM):
#orwikipedia

From Emily Gover to All Participants (02:24:13 PM):
#orwikipedia

From Michele Combs to All Participants (02:31:58 PM):
"why wouldn't people just stop at WP" -- one hopes because their teachers and professors won't let them ;)

From Kjerste Christensen to All Participants (02:33:07 PM):
If your library has a strong focus in a particular area, what about partnering with a WikiProject related to that subject area to look up information or scan media as needed?

From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:33:11 PM):
I think that's exactly true -- people with bar bets and general curiosity will stop at Wikipedia. Those who are pursing more serious research will hopefully be lured in to explore sources that are cited.

From Michele Combs to All Participants (02:33:47 PM):
Kjerste - really like that idea
From Vic Nunez to All Participants (02:35:40 PM):
+1 Elizabeth H

From Lane Rasberry to All Participants (02:36:31 PM):
At the last Wikimania I met a participant who was arrested for editing Wikipedia articles about revolution. Wikipedia is serious business! Be careful!

From Emily Gover to All Participants (02:43:54 PM):
June 16 is “Bloomsday” :)

From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:46:32 PM):
You can find out more about the VIAFbot and see the discussion here:

From Lane Rasberry to All Participants (02:47:23 PM):
? What do you mean?

From Merrilee Proffitt to All Participants (02:47:31 PM):

From Michele Combs to All Participants (02:50:40 PM):
Connections between VIAF project and EAC-CPF?

From Jerry Simmons to All Participants (02:53:49 PM):
Can you target one agency’s authority records in VIAF so that they get created automatically, then have them in one group/space for editing?

From Janifer Gatenby to All Participants (02:54:02 PM):
The templates seem important for establishing links by tagging important elements. Do the templates affect the quality rating?

From Bob Kosovsky to All Participants (02:54:43 PM):
Max: WP is 6th most used website; but acc. to visualizations I’ve seen, DPpedia is THE most used data source; can you talk about the implications of DPpedia being the MAIN source of data/information for numerous websites?

From Sherri Berger to All Participants (02:55:22 PM):
Michele: the SNAC project is also investigating creation of EAC-CPF records and using VIAF records to enhance them http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/about.html

From Sherri Berger to All Participants (02:56:24 PM):
Hah touche Merrilee -- acronym overload!

From Matt Senate to All Participants (02:56:41 PM):
Matt here at PLOS, wondering what you think about the potential for feedback with the VIAF project, how will the data evolve and be contributed to, or even updated in the future after the initial bot runs? (Clarification: is the bot to run regularly off an updated database?)

From Michele Combs to All Participants (02:58:36 PM):
Rule of thumb seems to be "no institutional WP accounts," only individual ones so that there is a single responsible person for each edit; would you advocate permitting creation of institutional accounts for creation/editing so as to make edits more credible/authoritative?