

Recollection Wisconsin Service Hub Governing Board
Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2016
Marquette University

ATTENDEES: Peter Gorman (UW-Madison – for Lee Konrad), Ann Hanlon (UW-Milwaukee), Scott Mandernack (Marquette), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Stef Morrill (WiLS), Gail Murray (DPI – for Ryan Claringbole)

ABSENT: Matt Blessing (WHS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Emily Pfothenauer, WiLS

DPLAFest updates

Emily, Ann and Gail all attended DPLAFest. It was a fantastic meeting and good to see how impressive this initiative has become. They have 13 million records (with 1 million from the National Archives added the night before!).

Hydra-in-a-box development

This is a DPLA initiative in collaboration with Stanford and DuraSpace to develop an out-of-a-box implementation of Hydra stack (Fedora, Solar, and Blacklight) so more institutions can have repository services and they are looking to have a hosted option. The idea would be to consolidate IR, Exhibits, and other functions in one platform. November 17, 2016 is the end date for this phase of the project, though it's unclear if they will roll out something at that point. There is a blog and wiki to keep track of the project. It's also unclear how it relates to DSpace, another DuraSpace product that is essentially a competitor. They are focusing on aggregation workflows, as that's a DPLA priority, but would also be helpful for migration. Ann is hoping to get UW-Milwaukee in as a pilot for the project.

Funding session

Emily attended a session of the major DPLA funders who talked about funding available at the hub level: IMLS, NEH, Knight Foundation, Sloan Foundation, and Whiting Foundation. They are all very interested in DPLA as a funding priority. IMLS is putting forward an idea of a national digital platform which includes not just infrastructure but also training and people. They are looking for models on the national level, not one-off projects. There is no expectation that there will be grant funding for hubs. Knight Foundation has committed funding to help states with Knight communities (which does not include Wisconsin). NEH and IMLS talked about leveraging some of their grant categories, like National Leadership Grants, to help facilitate hub activities. NEH mentioned the Recollection Wisconsin planning grant for Oral Histories as an example of what hubs should be doing! Going forward, should we be looking at other collaborative grants? The NEH grant does set us up for an implementation grant.

Ann and Emily presentation on consulting model

Ann and Emily presented on consultation model during a hub showcase session. They talked about the project in context of the service hub and working with fewer resources than some other hubs. The consultation model resonated with the audience. There was interest in seeing the consultation

documentation once it's created. In a lot of ways, even though we don't have a lot of funding, we have a strong foundation to build on, that some states don't have who haven't already been aggregating metadata. The fact that we have a multi-type consortium is a good starting ground, too, that other states don't have. DPLA had good feedback about our metadata pipeline – they were very happy with the metadata and use of an application profile, and think we're doing well with our hub implementation. Just FYI -- Ohio State Library has provided LSTA funding for three years for three positions to start their hub!

Rights statements

Ann and Emily attended the workshop on copyright and rights. DPLA launched rightsstatements.org on the day before the workshop. There are 11 rights statements. Some are specific to Europe. DPLA is behind this project because they would like people to be able to facet on copyright status (filter out public domain, for example). Europeana already does this faceting. There was a study of the rights statements in DPLA and they found that rights statements have more unique terms than descriptions! Often the language in the rights statements we have are not necessarily about the rights status, but about who owns it or citation information. As institutions create metadata, we should be thinking about moving that information into more appropriate fields. There is no timeline for implementing the rights statements, and DPLA is eager for people to implement them. NYPL is beginning to implement now. There are conversations that need to be had at individual institutions. There are local counsel that would need to be consulted and approve the statements. Ann will take to UW-Milwaukee digitization committee to discuss and then she will take to their legal.

If it isn't the university's intellectual property, does legal need to be consulted? Whenever using legal language, UW-Milwaukee has it vetted, as does UW-Madison. Other institutions may not need to do this.

Figuring out how to apply the statements is another step. There are not technical guidelines out. The URIs would be in the metadata. It's a good time for us to look at it as we are just now doing the MODS transformation from existing and it has a field and attribute that would be appropriate for the URI. If UW is harvesting Dublin Core from institutions, we will have to work out where this goes and how to harvest it or add it. UW-Madison has a lot of metadata where rights statements are wrong, so they are already thinking about this, so it's good timing. There are technical implementation issues as well as determining copyright status, which will be a labor issue. Some staff from WiLS met with SOIS and Dr. Lipinski is very interested in this and there may be some partnership with students working on figuring out copyright status of items. The rights statements are intended to be used internationally, so "public domain" is not used because it means different things in different countries. It was just announced that DPLA is going to do a two part webinar series on May 10 (introduction) and May 17 (implementation) to begin educating on the rights statements.

In terms of the hub, we are learning more about it. UW-Milwaukee and UW-Madison are the biggest collections, so we can learn from how it works to implement them there. We don't need to do it all at once and we can phase it in as we migrate collections.

Report from Gail Murray

Gail focused on K12 education and outreach aspects. In those sessions, there were similar programs: Smithsonian Learning Lab, for example. DPLA has done research with educators to determine how things will be used and how they can be helpful in those efforts. Both DPLA and Smithsonian Learning

Lab have published reports on this. DPLA has created 100 Primary Source Sets that can be a gateway to getting educators and students into the resources. Gail is happy to share her notes. Educators curate and provide a contextual background and lesson plans in these sets. They were grant funded, so it's unclear if they will produce more. They have been well received in the education community. Because Wisconsin's collections aren't in DPLA yet, we can't be included in the primary source sets yet. It would be good to know how these are being updated so we could get materials added.

Gail is working on WISELearn, which is an OER repository for educators in Wisconsin. The primary source sets are available to be ingested into OER repositories, so they hope to ingest them into WISELearn soon.

Emily also gave a quick update on DPLA hub status: Records have been turned over to DPLA and they have harvested them and working on the mapping/enrichment phase. We may have QA as early as next week. Once it's in the QA, the Metadata Workgroup and anyone else who would like to help will review them. DPLA has been doing QA all along, so it's more focused on local knowledge now – institution names correct, right amount of records, etc. Once the QA is available, there will be a checklist created for the review, as there is no guidance from DPLA. We don't know how long the review process will take, but hope the workgroup will be able to jump on it asap. If things need to be changed, they will pull the entire harvest again. Once we are live, we will be re-harvested every two months, at least to start. The UW-Madison harvest will need to be timed with the DPLA harvest to make sure it is all coordinated.

Review draft Service Hub Consulting Service program document

UW-Milwaukee did a consultation with Shorewood. It went well. They had already done digitization of 45 photos of a local amateur photographer, so the focus was metadata, rights, copyright, etc. Ann did the upload for them to Milwaukee Public Library ContentDM, which we may want to alter the document to reflect. There were a couple of in-person meetings. It was perhaps a total of 12 hours. UW-Milwaukee and Marquette need to determine how they might divvy things up and how to market or discover collections and institutions that need help. Ann will be visiting with Medical College of Wisconsin to help with audio materials. There is not much to revise in the documentation at this point. Ann will do some more follow-up from the last meeting. We still are not talking about preservation at this point. It will be an open question for a while. Educating them that it's even an issue is a good start.

Emily is going to be doing a workshop for CUWL on digital preservation related to project management aspects, how you work with your institution, and how you start thinking about it. It's not the technical side of it. It comes up a lot during conversations with institutions and with the Board and it should be a bigger conversation at some point soon.

Emily, Ann, and Scott will discuss how consultation requests should be handed off to them and develop a process.

The Wisconsin Public Library Consortium has funded some work and part of it is an RFQ for digitization vendors. This will hopefully create a "go to" list of vendors that could be beneficial for the Consulting Service program, too. Minnesota did one of these a number of years ago, and it was an endorsement rather than just a laundry list of vendors. There were a number of questions asked and it was very in-depth. We probably won't go quite that deep. Emily will be completing it this year. UW-Milwaukee had done an RFP to digitize their student newspaper and had to provide a lot of guidance to the

purchasing office to let them know how to choose. They have a list of questions they could share for the RFQ.

Other things that are being created for WPLC include sample metadata for common objects, sample copyright statements, and guidance for scanning (including encouraging them to purchase digitization services if they can afford it). OCLC came to visit Milwaukee PL recently and they found out that they are not going to have a non-hosted option for ContentDM for any new customers moving forward. We will be grandfathered in.

For the Consulting Program, it would be good to keep in mind the possibilities of using students to assist with the projects. Some of them are coming through SOIS and are trained by UW-Milwaukee libraries when they work with them. Public History students would also benefit from this opportunity.

Developing Digitization Experts in Three States Grant

Illinois, Georgia, and New Jersey are in Round 2 of an IMLS grant application. The pre-proposal has been accepted, and they have been invited to submit a full proposal. RAILS reached out to WiLS to provide consulting services on curriculum development for the training program. There is an argument to be made that this could be a Service Hub function and benefit. We could potentially run a team concurrently with their funded ones.

It could fit into our Consulting Model so that it could get more people to enhance their expertise. The grant is going to be pitched with a focus toward collections that are not available in DPLA. The grant period would start in December 2016. December 2016-September 2017 would be the time for developing the curriculum, with the first cohort running in September/October 2017.

The group discussed if this fits into the Service Hub? Once the resources are developed, they could be used in Wisconsin as well as in other states, and that would be useful. There is the genesis of many of these resources here. There is a lot of expertise among our partners to help, too. Building the partnership with the other states would be good, and good to be on IMLS radar, too. WiLS and Emily have been building this relationship with WiLS, and they have identified us as a digitization expert. The group felt that it fit in the Recollection Wisconsin wheelhouse.

Discuss partner agreements: letter of commitment or charter models

Stef and Emily have talked about this quite a bit. At one point, we had a notion of MOUs for all partners and then we had the notion of a letter of commitment, and then we thought maybe it would instead be a charter that we would all sign on to. WiLS has an MOU with Milwaukee Public Library for the hosting and have in the past had an MOU with UW-Madison for the harvesting.

It would be good for us to write down the spirit of our cooperation. Some of the language exists in the service hub documentation. Emily looked for other examples, but most Hubs don't have formal charters.

Some things to include: Not pulling out willy-nilly, providing certain responsibilities, what they will get out of it. Don't make it too elaborate. It would be useful in our own institutions to be able to explain the responsibilities. Emily will share a Google doc with existing language and Ann would take a first stab at putting it together. We're meeting at the end of July to review and finalize.

For the mission statement aspect: Collaboration angle, multi-type aspect.

We have an MOU with Milwaukee PL and they will still want to keep that in place. WiLS will need to create a new letter of commitment, too. For UW-Madison, the MOU has passed its expiration date, so Emily will work with Peter and Lee to create a new agreement that would be longer than one year. UW-Milwaukee and Marquette will revisit what might need to be in place once the consulting service is further along. They should track the hours spent so it's clear what the in-kind contribution is.

Review copyright policy

The Steering Committee put together a copyright policy. They had originally included a sentence from the old copyright documentation that said something about partners only putting online things that are in the public domain or for which they have permission from copyright holder. Numerous committee members said that we aren't that conservative if something is undetermined, so that language was struck from the document.

The policy says that the service hub will work with the content partners to adopt the new standardized rights statements, which does not suggest that providers would not have to adopt these. We want to point out they exist and the stronger language could be that they would be expected to adopt, and it may be too early to do that because there isn't a clear path for adopting them at this point.

For that sentence, could it be modified to "to determine whether and how to adopt standardized rights statements" or strike the word "adopt" and put in "review" or "review standardized rights statements with an eye toward adoption on a timeline appropriate for DPLA."

There is a difference between Creative Commons and rights statements. CC is about licensing; the standardized statements are about copyright status.

FINAL VERSION: *The Service Hub will work with Content Partners to review standardized rights statements, with an eye towards adoption on a timeline appropriate for DPLA.*

Someone from the committee suggested legal counsel review the copyright policy. The goal of this document is to not make it too legal and it is not legally binding. The board discussed this question. The only thing counsel might care about is the process for removing copyrighted material, as it's putting responsibility on the content partner and they may care about the CCO metadata (though people have already agreed to that). It's likely that institutions already have process in place for removing content. UW-Milwaukee and UW-Madison were both comfortable with this.

The Content Partner agreement includes a statement that partners would abide by the Copyright Policy.

Discuss composition of Steering Committee

There are statements of purpose for the Steering Committee and Board. They are both to be reviewed now that Phase I is complete.

It has come up at previous meetings that the Board and Steering Committee are heavily Madison and Milwaukee representation and representation from museums and smaller institutions are minimal. The Governing Board are the seven partners and each of those partners appoints someone from the Steering Committee. Paul Hedges, Steering Committee Chair, and Emily discussed increasing the breadth of the Steering Committee.

The group discussed the charge of the Steering Committee. It's meant to be an arm of the board and made up of practitioners and those in the field. The makeup should reflect the future goals of the

Board. The goal of the service hub going forward is to encourage and manage the growth of the hub, including more materials from existing partners and adding more institutions and types of materials. For the Steering Committee, they are speaking more for their constituencies, not just their institution. The charge from DPLA relevant to the Steering Committee is the community of practice-related goals, which relates to #5 on the Steering Committee charge. *Providing outreach to their partners, and with DPLA staff, developing local practitioners' capacity on topics such as open data, data quality and standards, copyright and licensing, and other relevant subjects.*

There is the potential for adding other governing board members if someone wanted to make a contribution of some kind and had some level of statewide leadership in the area. The big gap is the museum community, both on the Board and the Steering Committee. WHS has a museum division, but Matt is in the library/archives area and speaking on behalf on that. Do we need to seek out a museum partner to round out this representation? Milwaukee Public Museum was around for a long time, but had to drop activities due to budget constraints. The Neville Museum in Green Bay has also had some cuts. It's difficult to determine what might be the contribution. The museum community isn't jumping on this, and having museums better represented on the Steering Committee could help get interest activated.

Do any other hubs have good museum representation? It seems like they mostly are academic focused. Minnesota is working with the Minneapolis Institute of Art.

You want the people who are most engaged so the Board institutions are ones that are already there. It may not be necessary to exclude ourselves if there aren't a lot of people out there who want to be on the group.

Right now, there are 9 people. They primarily meet by phone, once a month, though it will likely be less frequent now that we are through Phase I. If we added three committee members: museum community, small public library or a system that deals with a lot of small public libraries, perhaps, local historical society and targeted those.

The people on the Steering Committee were selected to participate. Are we okay with continuing that? Do we need to be more open? Perhaps the Steering Committee could be the "community" that nominates new members as indicated in the charge. In the future, being out in the community more with consulting, could be another source of potential steering committee members.

Does the board see specific priorities for the next phase of the Steering Committee? There is a sub-committee that was spawned related to communications for the DPLA launch. It's probably a short-term thing. Promotion is something that the Steering Committee could/should be doing. One person from the Steering Community and one of the DPLA community reps and a couple of other people are serving on that sub-committee.

They created the copyright agreement, collection policy, and the partner agreement. They have created the communication about the launch. The Board reviews their policies, so they don't need to do that. Some ideas:

- Educational outreach/outreach to specific communities
- Education on copyright or other educational needs
- Prioritizing new content additions

- Investigation of the preservation question: what's happening in other states and discussing models.

Implementing rights statements seems like a big project onto itself.

Until recently, UW-Madison hadn't been doing preservation and has been aware of the risks. Trying to evaluate how to mitigate risk and understanding what the risks are. It could impact selection and how to bring that into the conversation in general.

Possibility of facilitating a statewide preservation network? The board begins a conversation about how we want to have the conversation. Pull the discussions together that are happening around the state, and explore what's being done by other Hubs. Talk about how to talk about it in July.

Emily will take the recommendations back to the Steering Committee about the makeup and priorities.

Next Meeting: July 22, Madison