20.03.2011, 16:42

Unregistered

Guest

English Contributors

There appears to be no specific information for England page contributors although a template page inviting contributions exists for parishes. These parish lists for the counties are presumably pre 1851 parishes as parish creations subsequently are not included.
Who is being invited to submit information about the Family History Library and the catalogue?
What is the purpose of inviting film numbers for census when the images are online at Ancestry.co.uk, Find My past other websites and why is it considered useful to ask for these to be retrieved?
It is also perhaps a minor point but the template has American spellings in it and it may be worth considering if different spellings might not jar quite so much on potential English contributors.

20.03.2011, 19:04

jamestanner

English Contributors response

It sounds like to me that you and others in England need to start contributing to the Wiki. If you think alternate spellings would help, I suggest putting in both American and English versions. As for film numbers, not everyone wants to pay for a subscription to Ancestry.com. In addition, as films are digitized and released on FamilySearch.org's Historical Record Collections they are also available online and the films are retired from circulation.

_____

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

24.03.2011, 10:00

Unregistered

Guest
James,
You may not have considered that you were responding to a substantial contributor to England wiki, part of a group of contributors who have substantially added to wiki this year. Your response might have been kinder.
The questions raised represents the view of a group of contributors.
There appear to be two audiences for films:
Online film orders in Europe, Australia and South Africa
or those in USA who visit the Family History Library or other libraries.

The question was who should be adding the film numbers in response to the template invitation to do so?

The use of the catalogue raises questions for English contributors. Take a look at the recent revision to Somerset the English county in the wiki then look at the "Somersetshire" entries in the catalogue to see the scale of mistrust of the catalogue in England. Compare the Library Catalogue with a county record office catalogue and the questions increase.

The point made about American spelling in the template page is valid; English potential contributors often say they find it off putting.

The way forward may be to acknowledge that the content about parish records needs to address two audiences. It should include partner organisations like Ancestry.co.uk and Find My Past and others (the National Archive preferred partner) for online access to indexes and images. It should also reflect the available GSU film which may only represent a part of the total records for the parish. Although the GSU had good co-operation in film acquisition it does not have complete coverage of all parishes in English diocesan records.

Could a revised template be devised to cover these points?

The present structure of English pages is formed on Church of England Pages prior to 1851 and this is consistent with maps.familysearch.org development. However an Ancient Parish or Ecclesiastical Parish is only part of a village or township history. Civil Parishes, Sanitary Authorities, local government in urban, rural and metropolitan districts are all relevant. Indeed centres of population move away from the Anglican chapelry/parish church which may be without vehicle access, electricity or water/sanitation and some miles away from parishioners.

The initial phase of wiki is a substantial effort for English contributors but is only a beginning and some thought needs to be given to references to local government boundary changes affecting civil registration districts as this affects where you apply for a BMD certificate. The invitation to contribute a parish history is open ended there is no guidance offered how to address other faiths; deconsecrated churches may have been used by many subsequent faiths in the last 60 years.

The question about microfilm use for census searches is also valid. Who is that information intended for? FamilySearch Historical records provides index access to partner sites and in the classic familysearch.org version to the data indexed by LDS volunteers for the 1881 England and Wales Census. Perhaps this heading content would benefit from revision to be clearer on what is intended. Is the audience an international online research audience who will use online census or is it the visitor to Salt Lake who wants to locate a microfilm in the British Isles floor of the library?

English contributors would welcome some response on these questions and please bear in mind the voluntary contributions being made already to assist FamilySearch with local knowledge rather than suggest we "need to start".

24.03.2011, 10:30
cottrells

Easy, I think we should always assume good faith, that we are all working to improve the resources available.

Being from England this thread interested me, but I admit I'm not quite following the questions raised nor the response, so I maybe missing the mark in what I say next.

I think the original poster was asking for guidance about making contributions to articles about localities in England. There is an article in the wiki called England Barn Raising Tasks. I think this project needs a spring clean, so to speak, I've been considering it for some time and this thread has prompted me to think about it again.

When it comes to it FamilySearch has provided the wiki as a space for the wider community to share their knowledge/research experience with each other. If you feel that something can be improved, then be bold and make the change. The point about parish information being right for 1851, but not showing changes that have happened since is valid. Hopefully overtime contributions from people with local knowledge will add this missing data. I've done some work on Dorset pages, but it is a huge task just for that one county.

24.03.2011, 13:22

jamestanner

Sorry, no offense intended

I am sorry if I came across too strongly. 😟 My point is that if there is a perception that information is either inaccurate or incomplete in the Wiki then the person with the correct or complete information does not have to ask permission to make the changes. All such changes are really appreciated.

I note today, that portions of Utah were added to the online film ordering system and everyone is supposed to be on the system in the near future.

Question about adding information: Anyone can add the information if they have it to add.

I agree with cottrells in the last post, I am not sure what you are referring to. However, it seems that most of the questions you are raising could be addressed by the contributors in the Discussion/Talk portions of the individual pages. I am sorry once again if I have offended you or anyone else, no offense was intended. My comment was intended to mean that there is no "permission" or approval process in the Wiki. However, it is a good idea to raise the issues. Hopefully, those who have the specific knowledge to make the changes you suggest will do so. You certainly have my support.

I might suggest that might consider registering and posting some information here in the forums. You are presently showing up as an Unregistered guest. Again, sorry for any offense.

_____

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

24.03.2011, 16:04

VasquezJL

I believe the original poster is referring to a "template" - but I'm not sure what that template is. Could you clarify where this template is? Are you referring to the skeleton that most original pages are built with? Or is there somewhere else a separate "template

invitation"?

I don't know that we have guidelines regarding the spelling, but I don't see any problems with proposing that spelling should reflect that of the country the pages are about. Unfortunately, other than "colour" and "centre", I would have no idea how to spell things other than Americanized, so we'll have to let those of you who know how to spell them right fix it. 🙂

I think the other thing pointed out is that these pages may lean too far to referring to the FHLC holdings for everything. I agree that where things are available at other repositories/online, it's not a bad idea to add them. WeRelate has come up with a good way of doing this kind of thing - they have detailed source pages where all of the ways to access a collection are included. Example:http://www.werelate.org/wiki/Source:...land_and_Wales

So ideally, someone should know that they can order a film from a FHC if they don't want to subscribe to Ancestry, but they should also know that it's available from Ancestry or FindmyPast (or others) if they want to subscribe. How best to refer to multiple holders of a single important collection is a good question.....thoughts?

26.03.2011, 02:50
Englandcollective
In the beginning there were blank pages for parishes in England. Then a template page was added to each parish page which has headings which invite contributions. Here are two such paragraphs.
Church records

Contributor: Include here information for parish registers, Bishop's Transcripts, non conformist and other types of church records, such as parish chest records. Add the contact information for the office holding the original records. Add links to the Family History Library Catalog showing the film numbers in their collection

Census records

Contributor: Include an overview if there is any unique information, such as the census for X year was destroyed. Add a link to online sites for indexes and/or images. Also add a link to the Family History Library Catalog showing the film numbers in their collection.

We hope that this clarifies the issues in previous posts on these points.

If wording and links for online census can be established for census then any contributor can edit the existing page as they work on any other aspect of a page.

American spelling example often encountered:

To find the names of the neighboring parishes, use England Jurisdictions 1851. In this site, search for the name of the parish, click on the location "pin", click Options and click List contiguous parishes.

In English "neighbouring". We like the suggestion of adopting English spelling for English pages 😊 There is little we can do about Family History Library Catalog which we would refer to as a Catalogue as it is integral to FamilySearch.

FamilySearch has an unfortunate negative image in European Family History societies as being user unfriendly and any steps to translate for an English readership would help overcome this.

Cottrells if you need help in any English county we may be able to offer some suggestions. The collective is currently working in Northumberland, Durham,Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Somerset. Members have also contributed extensively to Norfolk, Essex, Cornwall, Bristol and Warwickshire.

Our reservation on adding any content from the Family History Library Catalogue is based on the two versions available:

Classic version is updated regularly and includes digital image acquisitions for FamilySearch Historical Records digital image only collections (that is not derived from microfilm)

The "snapshot" version on familysearch.org which is not up to date and omits many acquisitions. In English counties FamilySearch Indexing content is not reflected in this version. There is no indication of which years within a parish were indexed in any wiki page.

FamilySearch Indexing collections with no content tables 😣 😡 do not make for happy searches for records in a parish; you know that some of the parish has been indexed but it's guesswork from there.

For these reasons we suggest it is not appropriate at present to add any content to the "Church Records" invitation until a single "live" Catalogue is available. It is possible to identify online images and references to deposited records at archives in England but the FamilySearch data is being built as part of site development and can and has resulted in incomplete or inaccurate information entering the wiki pages. Until site development is complete in this respect we suggest that a key part of the page should be on hold. The question remains who is responsible for adding this information and link to the final version of the Family History Library Catalogue?

We would also like a link to the Online Film Ordering process to become integral if microfilm is being quoted. Again if this could be readily available to all contributors it would help; an idea perhaps for the FamilySearch managers to consider.

26.03.2011, 17:01
jamestanner
A partial response

I think I am up to the risk of being misunderstood. The nature of a Wiki is that no one person or whatever is "responsible" to add anything to the Wiki. In a real sense, we are all responsible. Responsibility resides in those with the knowledge. I would guess that the FHLC will never be anything more than a work in progress so the Wiki entries will also always be evolving. As the links or information change, the Wiki community will make the necessary changes to the Wiki pages. Any user who sees a misstatement, lack of information, broken link, or any other issue with the Wiki can and should change the entry to correct the misstatement, supply the missing information or fix the broken link. We all have a general, not a specific, responsibility to do so.

In the matter of American vs. English spelling and terminology, to the extent possible both should be shown. I suggest the following as an example:

"I found it in the catalog (English; catalogue) or the reverse, whatever.

it is clear that you and your friends have done a fabulous job of adding information to the Wiki. But we are not out here in Wikiland to tell you or anyone else how to do your job as long as users conform to the Wiki policies and procedures. 🙂

—————————————

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

27.03.2011, 02:26
Englandcollective

James,
The existing invitation to reference microfilm and Library Catalogue has been overtaken by the construction in progress to publish records.
We have more than a few years wikipedia contribution experience in the group (around 75 years combined in fact) but the problem lies organisationally within FamilySearch hence the query who is working to ensure
1. That a single functional library catalogue is produced to reflect both the historical film acquisition
2. The FamilySearch Indexing parish coverage in Index collections derived from filming
3. The digital image only collection acquisitions online at FamilySearch Historical Records and which parishes are loaded and which remain to be loaded. (look at the online Durham Bishops Transcripts series to see the scale of omitted parishes which have been recorded in the wiki pages for parishes in Northumberland and Durham).
4. To add to the contributions from local deposited record sources (we like the Werelate suggestion but that needs to be formalised as guidance to all contributors somehow if the contributing community are to consistently use it) information from the FamilySearch catalogue in a once only entry that will reliably work and seamlessly meet the needs of all researchers online or in FamilySearch centres and library in Salt Lake. Our point is this element is not yet in place in the construction of the site and wiki cannot provide this information yet.
5. If the current Adobe Flash Player technology is replaced as intended any wiki link will not function so it is inadvisable to include such links.
6. We do not feel the time in creating information in need of revision very shortly is

worthwhile until FamilySearch has a stable site in which these various elements can be added as knowledge for researchers. Over to FamilySearch management on this issue. The desire to add information in future is inhibited by the piecemeal construction by FamilySearch underway at present and the wiki invite might need to reflect this approach.

27.03.2011, 09:55

jamestanner

Thanks for the clarification

I believe I now understand the issues you are raising and can agree. You are correct, it seems to be a wasted effort to use the FHLC if the parameters of use are going to change considerably in the future. At this point it looks like the issues are more with the development of the FHLC rather than any Wiki related issues. The Wiki issue appear to be derived from a lack of certainty with the future of the FHLC. Any one else have any suggestions?

_____

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

28.03.2011, 04:46

cottrells

I have renamed the old *England Barn Raising Tasks* article to become the starting point for a **WikiProject England**. I welcome all contributions to help set the scope, goals and tasks for this project. In my mind this project will focus on pages that cover resources from a national perspective and the main page for each county. Seperate WikiProjects for each county could be started that can then focus on the parishes and county specific research advice. If you have a different view, please let me know and hopefully we can work together to improve the content in the Wiki about England.

01.04.2011, 17:49

jamestanner

A question of perspective

I don't know that the terms "good" and "bad" apply. The issue seems to be whether or not the pages reflect the predominant culture and language usage in the target country. From that standpoint,a person with that particular cultural awareness would be in the best position to make those types of determinations. I would suggest that those who read a page and see issues with cultural bias, make changes that reflect both the particular and general culture. It would not be a good idea from my perspective to turn the Wiki into a cultural battleground. I suggest using terms like "Locally referred to as..." or "The common way of spelling in _____ is..." You fill in the blanks.

_____

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

02.04.2011, 23:57

FHLC links

What I was trying to ask for is parish pages in the wiki where the template has been pretty well filled out and ones that haven't. I am interested in well developed parish pages so that I can see what is being done to follow the template guidance and what is being done with links to the FHLC.

_____

Darris G. Williams, Accredited Genealogist; Wales, England

13.04.2011, 04:05

henry995

Completed pages

Darris,
You could try any of the Staffordshire/Derbyshire page additions. My suggestion is to compare the FHLC information for Barrow upon Trent Derbyshire with the deposited register information already added to the wiki page by contributors.
The catalogue does not refer to missing years in the deposited registers at Derbyshire Record Office (Matlock) merely the filmed years.
Until the Catalogue stabilises (and we have seen some wiki page edits with comments that December 2011 is intended for a single version of the Catalogue) English contributors of my acquaintance are not touching the Catalogue film numbers in response to the invitation which was embedded in the England page headings.
Another suggestion is to use the London Family History Centre Catalogue page for parishes as a local resource.
If you look at Northumberland or Durham Pages which are a digital image only acquisition of Durham Bishop's Transcripts published online at Historical Records there is another style of content. Until the catalogue resolves to reflect digital image acquisitions (which for this series are not susceptible to FHLC search) the request for catalogue information is irrelevant. One factor in the technical presentation of the Durham transcripts which has delayed the collection revision is the absence of catalogued information.

13.04.2011, 07:31

jamestanner

👍 Catalog issues

I believe I understand what you are saying about the FHLC. I suggest that your comments might be appropriate for the Wiki. I note that on Barrow on Trent, Derbyshire page, that there is a note on the main page which says:

Contributor: Include here information for parish registers, Bishop's Transcripts and other types of church records, such as parish chest records. Add the contact information for the office holding the original records. Add links to the Family History Library Catalog showing the film numbers in their collection

I suggest that the "Discussion" page, which is part of each page in the Wiki, is the

appropriate place to discuss the limitations and additions to any given page. However, if there are issues such as the ones you discuss with the FHLC, it would seem appropriate to make those issues known in the text of the Wiki. You may also wish to comment in the Library Catalog Sub-Forum under FamilySearch.org. Go to the Home page for the Forums and you will see that there is a specific Sub-forum for FamilySearch.org and a subsequent Sub-forum for the Library Catalog.

I see no reason why the comments you make should not be included in the Discussion pages concerning the records you are working on. Also, they could be included in a section of the individual pages as an explanation for users of the FHLC.

Thanks for your comments. 🙂

_____
James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

14.04.2011, 01:04
henry995
😟 Catalogue

The Catalogue can be useful for an English based researcher however it is essentially a Catalogue for the Family History Library in Salt Lake and has a strict hierarchy which unfortunately can be difficult to use in English based searches for certain record types.
Whilst I appreciate the suggested use of wiki discussions it is already a considerable task to research the deposited records for a diocese (often involving several counties) and the limited scope of the microfilm content in the Family History Library Catalogue. To add to the contributors task a discussion post is perhaps a step too far?
The limitation of the Catalogue might best be acknowledged by revising the current invitation to contributors.
The Catalogue has not come to terms with Digital image acquisitions and FamilySearch Indexing project content. It is not possible at present for me to determine which parish and year range the Familysearch Indexing for a county title are covered by the index.
On other sites on the internet it is possible to refer to a content table or an updates page to see exactly which church and years are included.
FamilySearch Indexes contain no means of locating this information. It seems to me that the wiki page for each set of indexed parishes should include a list of parishes covered.
Indexing Projects are done in Parts, A B C D etc and it should be possible to identify which parishes are in the block under way and year coverage. The Parish page could then be edited to indicate intended or actual content.
At present the FamilySearch Indexing operation is not joined up to the need for wiki contributors to have such information and the FHLC content is not joined up either.
The quality of information provided by these disparate groups for potential wiki editing is just not available at preent and without better presentation no wiki contributor can progress a partial page.
The level of frustration amongst researchers is therefore high. English indexes have no image attachments and there are clear indexing errors and puzzles and FamilySearch offers no correction feature. Until some of these issues are resolved the simplest and safest wiki

contributions are based on local knowledge of Diocesan archives located in English record Offices.

The long held assumption that the FHLC was the central and essential resource was always challenged here in England. I recall many meetings over decades of English Genealogy (this is my 44th year) where criticisms of the hierarchy of the catalogue were expressed.

These are large organisational issues for FamilySearch and wiki content will be limited until they can be advanced.

14.04.2011, 10:09

randyhoffman

FHL template

I could be wrong, but one item that could help for linking to catalog items is the FHL template. To use it, go to the catalog item (in the new catalog) and look for a number in the URL that follows %2Fitem%2F

In the wiki article, place your cursor where you want the link to go, and type {{FHL|the number from the URL|title-id|disp=the text you want to display}}

For example: The {{FHL|267468|title-id|disp=Grisby Family Genealogy}} includes...

Will become The Grisby Family Genealogy includes...

So, you will have an external link that connects to the catalog item, and from my understanding, the URLs to catalog items might change in the future but that number will always be part of that item's URL. If you use this template, and the URLs are changed in the catalog, a quick change to the template will restore every link to the catalog within the wiki.

18.04.2011, 15:59

WilliamsDa

English Parish Pages

Quote:

> Originally Posted by **henry995** ⟩
>
> *Darris,*
> *You could try any of the Staffordshire/Derbyshire page additions. My suggestion is to compare the FHLC information for Barrow upon Trent Derbyshire with the deposited register information already added to the wiki page by contributors.*
> *The catalogue does not refer to missing years in the deposited registers at Derbyshire Record Office (Matlock) merely the filmed years.*
> *Until the Catalogue stabilises (and we have seen some wiki page edits with comments that December 2011 is intended for a single version of the Catalogue) English contributors of my acquaintance are not touching the Catalogue film numbers in response to the invitation which was embedded in the England page headings.*
> *Another suggestion is to use the London Family History Centre Catalogue page for parishes as a local resource.*
> *If you look at Northumberland or Durham Pages which are a digital image only acquisition of Durham Bishop's Transcripts published online at Historical Records*

> *there is another style of content. Until the catalogue resolves to reflect digital image acquisitions (which for this series are not susceptible to FHLC search) the request for catalogue information is irrelevant. One factor in the technical presentation of the Durham transcripts which has delayed the collection revision is the absence of catalogued information.*

First, I propose that we move the topic of the Durham Bishop's Transcripts to a different thread. There are several issues involved that should be documented. I think there are ways it might be resolved, with help from the wiki community.

Unfortunately I have been not been very involved with the wiki for about two years and so I may have missed some things in that time. Personally, I am not comfortable with making links from each parish to all the records listed in the Family History Library Catalogue (FHLC) for that place. In some ways it almost feels like that would make the wiki the poster child for the FHLC. It is much more than that!

Early in the development of the wiki there was discussion of where we should point people for available records. We felt the best thing was to point first to the records most readily accessible. Naturally that means free online records, pay to view online records, then the debate can get a bit complicated. There was no intent to make the wiki a world records manager. If that has changed please let me know.

I fear that by following the model of linking to everything available in the FHLC for a place we dilute the true value of the wiki, a place for research guidance. It's not really that simple but that's my first stab at expressing my view. I'm even uncertain about having the full text from Lewis' Topographical Dictionary on these parish pages as I found on the Barrow on Trent, Derbyshire page. I could see a page for topographical descriptions gleaned from various topographical dictionaries as a sub-page.

Since so many English records have been and now are obtained through original digital capture with no known plans for being listed in the FHLC any linking of English records in the FHLC will be incomplete. Then consider that FamilySearch has only acquired about 60% of the parish registers on microfilm or digitally.

I do like the concept of specifically identifying the years missing from the parish registers. The next evolutionary step, and what I envision for the wiki, is additional text that explains how to work around those missing records.

_____

Darris G. Williams, Accredited Genealogist; Wales, England

18.04.2011, 22:59
jamestanner

Comment on FHLC

I am limiting my comment to one issue raised about linking the Wiki to the FHLC. I think I agree that the Wiki should not be a "poster child" for the catalog. But I really doubt that even with extensive links to the FHLC that the Wiki will ever be that closely involved. I can see two differing levels, one where the Wiki directs people to specific resources in the FHLC

and another level where people are merely directed to the catalog or a page about the FHLC. I feel no pressure to list every book in every catalog dealing with a particular subject or location as long as the Wiki directs me to the catalog where the resources can be found. However, I think there is some merit to have directed links to specific resources if those resources in the FHL are particularly relevant to the topic of the page or something not likely to be found by the average user.

So, I would come down on a more liberal policy with respect to links to specific catalog items in any catalog, including the FHLC.

———————————————

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com