# Purpose and Appropriate Topics

06.03.2011, 11:11

jamestanner

## Purpose and Appropriate Topics

In reviewing what is currently online on the Wiki I was reading the page: FamilySearch Wiki:Purpose and Appropriate Topics. It appears that there has been no discussion of that page for about a year. I would focus on the the list of "FamilySearch Wiki is not..."

One item states, "An advertising medium for products or services." However, I find the current discussions here in the Forums showing that there are issues with advertising.

Another item states that the Wiki is not "A place to post images of LDS temples. " However, I find pictures posted on wiki pages by links. So I can't post a picture but I can post links to pictures?

I also see a statement under "Limited Topics" that says there should be a limit to, "Lists of Family History Library materials derived from the Family History Library Catalog (FHLC). The wiki isn't meant to replicate the FHLC. However, when a FHLC entry fails to provide enough information for patrons to be able to use a resource, the wiki, like the in-house Registers at the FHL, can complement the FHLC entry." These I also find in abundance.

We may wish to go back over the materials already published on the Wiki and see if they still apply. I hesitated to add comments to the Discussion Page of the Purpose and Appropriate Topics because of length of time since the page had been actively discussed. I thought it might be a dead topic.

---

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

10.03.2011, 07:11

VasquezJL

I don't think this is a dead topic at all. I think that people are watching these pages - they may or may not respond if info is put on the discussion page. That said, this forum isn't a bad place to bring it up either when it's something as all-encompassing as the "purpose and topics" of the wiki.

I think that the main issue we have is that contributors aren't aware of these guidelines. So they jump in, get both feet wet, and sometimes slip a little because they didn't know where

the rocks are.

Regarding temples - it seems to me that if we don't need pictures of temples, we maybe don't need links to temple pictures either... But maybe it depends on the page it's on?

Regarding the FHLC links - I'm a little confused by this policy. The FHLC is not necessarily obvious to new researchers. And even intermediate researchers. At the big genealogy nearby where I live, they have tons of resources, and the FHLC is a minor piece of the puzzle. If we make the Wiki a one-stop-shop for research help, how would it make the most sense to link out to the FHLC? With one standard link, the way we are now with the Forum and Online course badges, or to integrate the resources throughout the pages where they belong? If the Wiki is not a "World Records Manager," how do we refer people to the specific resources and collections that will best help them? How and where do I mention the great book I found on Buffalo city marriages that tied together a family for me?

So, I definitely think that that page still applies. However, it wouldn't hurt to review some of the items there.

15.03.2011, 10:46

jbparker

## Policy about Wiki content

Yes, this needs to be discussed.

15.03.2011, 11:43

cottrells

## New maintenance template - {{Content}}

As this can be a sensitive issue. I have created a new maintenance template **{{Content}}** that can be used in circumstances where the article contains content that appears contrary to the wiki policies. If you would like to change the wording used in this new template, let me know or feel free to amend it yourself.

Users who flag a page with the **{{Content}}** template should start a discussion on the talk page explaining their reasoning, including links to the policy in question.

Until now the only template available to use was {{Delete}}. This will probably still be used, but at a later stage once the issue has been highlighted and there has first been an opportunity to discuss the matter.

18.03.2011, 08:41

jamestanner

## Additional thoughts on content

Thanks for the Template. I think that will help with getting some discussions going.

I think we should be very careful in limiting the types of links, i.e. to the FHL Catalog or whatever. The Wiki, in effect, is acting as a meta-catalog pulling together more specific references to items that may be "hidden" by their proximity to too many other references in the FHLC.

Since there have been over 1500 articles added to the Wiki in the last week, I assume the task of overseeing these additions if only going to get larger and more complicated. I am definitely in the camp of a liberal inclusion policy as far as information is concerned, but I am in the conservative camp as far as moving outside the overall purpose and policies are concerned.

---

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

24.03.2011, 14:57

VasquezJL

So, regarding the question about the FHLC links, here is the policy from Limited Topics that I think you are referring to (maybe we can take these one at a time, where there are concerns?):

Quote:

> Lists of Family History Library materials derived from the Family History Library Catalog (FHLC). The wiki isn't meant to replicate the FHLC. However, when a FHLC entry fails to provide enough information for patrons to be able to use a resource, the wiki, like the in-house Registers at the FHL, can complement the FHLC entry.

I agree that I'm not sure where you draw the line. If you are teaching someone to research, you are going to mention all the great FHLC resources, as well as those from other repositories. The FHLC is somewhat hidden and not well known in beginning circles (though someone said today on Twitter that the Wiki was well hidden...oh well). So if we are sending people to the Wiki for research, why not link out to the FHLC resources?

In other words, I didn't (before I read this) think it inappropriate to take the FHLC catalog entries from a locality, say, Arizona, and scatter links to those them throughout the various Arizona pages where they belong. So it wouldn't be a list, but links to the FHLC entries might all end up in those locality pages. (Birth records would get put in the Arizona Vital Records page, etc.) But based on the above guideline, it's possible there is a problem with that - and maybe we need to find a different way to do it? Or maybe it's ok to add pieces here and there based on what people find most useful, but perhaps just not add everything.

I'm sure that there's a reason behind this one so I'm interested in what the background is.

---

*Last edited by janellv; 07.04.2011 at 15:10. Reason: wording*

25.03.2011, 13:03

jamestanner

## Links to the FHLC

One example, if I find several books that I feel would be helpful, I think it would be a good idea to link them out to the FHLC if they are available there. It might also be a good idea to link them to WorldCat.org or whatever to show where the book might be available.

Another example; If the main source of information about a locality or subject within a locality is the FHLC either books or microfilm, then why not show those links in the Wiki. Otherwise, what are the chances that the user will go look for information in the Catalog?

I guess I am coming down on the side of allowing links to the Catelog as long as the page is not just a duplication of the Catalog entries. However, scattering the entries around a State or locality seems to me to be acceptible also. 

---

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com

04.04.2011, 08:19

VasquezJL

Here's another thought on this topic. I can see how there would be a glut of a lot of individual items if every library were to put every piece of their collection separately into the Wiki. Perhaps that's the reason for these guidelines, and that's understandable. This isn't a "World Records Manager" - meaning a place to put every single source out there on every genealogy topic. What if we were to add a section to each locality that said something like, "These libraries have significant collections for this area. Check their library catalogs for specific resources to review," and then list the libraries there. Thoughts?

04.04.2011, 09:54

jamestanner

## Library list

Many localities already have a topic for libraries and repositories. I think the issue is when the books are specific to the topic of the page.

---

James Tanner
http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com