

NOTES

Recollection Wisconsin DPLA Service Hub Governing Board Quarterly Meeting

August 11, 2017

10:00am - 1:00pm

Digital Humanities Lab

Golda Meir Library, UW-Milwaukee

PRESENT: John de Bacher (DPI), Ann Hanlon (UW-Milwaukee), Lee Konrad (UW-Madison), Scott Mandernack (Marquette), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Stef Morrill (WiLS). Matt Blessing (WHS) joined by phone at 11:05.

GUESTS: Jim Lowrey (UW-Milwaukee)

PROJECT MANAGER: Emily Pfothauer (WiLS)

Welcome & introductions

The group welcomed John DeBacher, Director of Public Library Development for DPI. He is replacing Ryan Claringbole.

Hub updates

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is the second governance body, which is made up of appointees from the governing partners and representatives from the community. The committee has two-year terms, and many are coming to an end. Three of the appointed members from the governing partners are rotating: Marcy Bidney from UW-Milwaukee will be replaced by Nathan Humpal, Paul Hedges from WHS will be continuing; Liz Kaune from Milwaukee Public Library is moving to a new position and the appointee from MPL will be named after her position is filled. UW-La Crosse, Beloit College, and OWLS representatives are also completing their terms. An open call for nominations was put out, and received 8 high-quality nominees. There will be three new members in the Fall and two additional members in the Spring. The Board approved the new candidates. In September, Bethany Huse from College of Menominee Nation, Inese Christman from Wisconsin Valley Library Service, and Josh Hickman from Beloit College will be added. In the Spring, probably March, Joe Hermolin with the Langlade County Historical Society and Jamie McFarlane at Monarch Library System will be added. The Steering Committee meets in person in September (in Madison) and will set the schedule for the coming year.

Metadata ingest and new collections

The last metadata ingest is completed. UW-Madison did a refresh harvest in June and it went live in DPLA in July. It went very smoothly! UW-Madison will do another refresh harvest in September to go live in DPLA in October. There were two major new collections added in the last round. One is the Wisconsin Digital Archives, maintained by DPI, which collects mostly born digital government documents

from state agencies. It's about 15,000 records, and continues to grow. It's the digital version of the state document depository program. The other is the Legislative Reference Bureau digital collections, which is about 4,000-5,000 records, and includes legislative reports and fiscal reports that the LRB deals with. It makes clear the transparency of state records, which is appealing to people. It's also helpful because it provides a place where people can link within catalog records rather than the institution website. The LRB is one of the first in the state using the responsive version of CONTENTdm. They are very happy with it. The partners did not have any new collections that would be included in the next harvest.

Rights Statements implementation

This is the ongoing work to determine how we will implement the standardized rights statements from DPLA. They have been having monthly community of practice phone calls with hubs that are in the process of implementing the statements. A. Hanlon and E. Pfothauer have been on the calls, along with representatives from UW-Madison. Some small collections will be identified from UW-Milwaukee and UW-Madison to pilot to see how the metadata looks when it is harvested and added to DPLA. UW-Milwaukee will be using the March on Milwaukee collection. For some hubs, a bigger concern is identifying the correct rights statement. UW-Milwaukee has not encountered this yet. They are identifying the status, not the holder, so it has not been problematic.

The goal is to have fewer unique rights statements on materials in DPLA. It is parallel to Creative Commons licenses and DPLA worked with Creative Commons to develop the statements. The big difference is that these are not licenses, but instead, just statements of rights status. When records with this information are displayed in DPLA, there is a clear indication of the rights status and if people can use it. Public Domain is interesting because it is only a United States status. The statement makes it clear that it's just in the US. Any local statement you might have, "Property of Monroe Library", for example, aren't wanted by DPLA. They can be in the local records, but can't be harvested and passed to DPLA. When we have some rights statements ready for DPLA harvest, we will let DPLA know, so they can see how they will appear in the records. Once the pilots are done, a procedure will be developed for other partners.

DPLA interface enhancements: larger thumbnails, IIIF

DPLA is working on a few different enhancements to the dp.la website, including an overhaul of the site that should be out this Fall. They've recognized that a lot of the use of the website is the exhibitions, etc., which was not the original expected use. They thought their site would be minimal, as people would be using the API. They have done some user testing, and will be making some enhancements to the interface, including larger thumbnails. They are encouraging hubs to send larger thumbnails, up to 300 pixels. It's also a conceptual question, too: are we comfortable with a 300 pixel image? Will people no longer go to the original site? With the user testing, the users felt they wouldn't click through because they couldn't tell what the thumbnails were at 100 pixels. The group discussed if we need to talk with content partners about larger thumbnails. We have not heard anything from other hubs about the issue.

A IIIF-based image viewer is being integrated into DPLA, which will have an impact on click-throughs. iiifdemo.dp.la is an example site. With this viewer, an API will pull the full image into the DPLA site. It will only work if you have IIIF running on your server, and it will record the use when it pulls the image into the viewer. The new ContentDM integrates IIIF which means potentially, a lot of partners may have access to a IIIF endpoint. If we let DPLA know, and we get the information into the feed, they can implement it right away. We want people to come to our sites because there is a lot of additional context. However, we just want them to find our content, and this way, we will know they've been there. Thinking about it philosophically, they still know we have it and they've been able to use it, and we also have been able to track it. This feature will be available with the redesign this Fall. Using it will not be required, but we will want to experiment with some test collections.

Funding updates

YTD budget

Our fiscal year finished at the end of June.

We had received \$10,000 from the Bradley Foundation in the previous year, but we did not receive any additional funding. For the upcoming year budget, we have a smaller amount from the Nicholas Family Foundation.

FY18 draft budget

In the FY18/19 budget, there is a small shortfall. We hope this will be filled by the following year of LSTA, as that support is to begin in April 2018, assuming there is LSTA funding.

LSTA five-year plan 2018-2022

The plan is out, and DPLA is included as a priority. DPI tried to keep projects from being more than three years as federal funds, traditionally. However, they are starting to look more at the federal funds as being appropriate for statewide projects, which is why DPLA was included and made explicit. The intent is to continue to provide support for the DPLA project. If nothing else, it helps support cooperation and discussion and allegiances among digital content providers. Even if the DPLA portal doesn't lead to a lot of use, it is a cooperative way to do things. WISCAT might be a parallel example.

WHS got a second round of funding from NEH for the National Digital Newspaper Program. Another 12 or so newspapers will be selected. They will probably be English-language and will be weekly. The money is encumbered, so they won't have to worry about the current budget discussions at the federal level. This brings the total to almost \$500,000 of funding.

IMLS and NEH proposals

In June, E. Pfothauer submitted the full proposal for an IMLS grant to pair graduate students with local historical societies and libraries to work on digital preservation projects. We will know by the end of August, and would start in December. UW-Madison committed storage space for it, and other partners have committed in-kind contributions.

Also outstanding is an NEH implementation grant for digitizing and providing access to oral histories that were identified in the recent NEH planning grant. Submitted in July and we will hear in March 2018. If NEH goes away in the next budget cycle, then the grant would not have a chance to be funded. The grant includes an 80% position as a project manager.

For these two grants in particular, they are intended as project-based things to help fund the service hub, as there isn't money out there to fund the service hub specifically. The IMLS grant would also be a proof of concept for how other hubs could utilize a similar approach. One of the critical and key functions of the service hubs is the cooperative aspects of service and helping institutions with the entire lifecycle for digitization projects.

Pettit Foundation

The Jane Bradley Pettit Foundation is in Milwaukee and prioritizes education and lifelong learning, including Alzheimer's and memory work. We received \$5,000 for developing more educational resources from our DPLA content. It is still fairly informal, but there is a one-page report at the end. It will be either Emily's time or someone else's time to find the items. It will focus on Milwaukee history, specifically. If anyone would like to help contribute to that, let Emily know. The grant is a year, and we got it a month or so ago.

Discussion: DPLA Membership Model

Review new membership program and member agreement

The group discussed the new membership program and member agreement. This will include all hubs, even content hubs. North Carolina will not be a paying member, and they sent a letter to all hubs explaining their reasoning. NC will continue to share their data, and data will continue to be ingested by DPLA, though it may be a slower ingest schedule.

There is concern that, while the membership fee is starting at \$10,000, the amount may increase. DPLA has committed to keeping the fee flat for the next three years. What they are trying to do is to find a more stable funding model than what they have had. If everyone decides not to participate, it may threaten their existence. Without philosophical interests, hubs may decide the benefits are not worth the cost. One of the concerns is the lack of collection usage via DPLA. They are concerned about this, too, and are trying to use the platform effectively. DPLA is working on a new front-end for their own website, including improvements based on user feedback, like larger thumbnails and integrating full images. They are talking about analytics to gain a better understanding about how things are being reused. There is a lot of use through the APIs that is not tracked.

We all have discrete collections and bring them together, but then they are lost within the large quantity of records. The challenge is contextualizing the content within DPLA. The solution may be for DPLA to highlight how others are using the content, rather than being the ones who are contextualizing and curating the content. It would be nice if we could reach out to local teachers and perhaps National History Day participants. Playing a curation role is possibly one of the benefits of membership.

The listed benefits are mostly things they are doing now. One thing that is new is DPLA local, which would provide a local interface that could include Wisconsin materials generated from other states.

The group discussed the membership agreement itself. The agreement is for three years unless it's terminated earlier. Any fees paid are non-refundable. The benefits are not certain, so signing on for a three-year term may be concerning. We haven't yet paid anything to DPLA as dues or other onboarding fees.

The group discussed the philosophy of it. It's like taxes; it benefits the public good. It's still unclear about what their plans are for improving discoverability. There isn't a lot of growth in usage happening, and they've been at it for five years. The topic can be brought to the table through the new governance structure. There are other ways to receive feedback from the hubs aside from governance.

Value of DPLA goes beyond usage. What DPLA has been successful is pulling together the digital library community and talking and doing things together. This is a positive thing and we need it as a place to talk about platforms and building digital collections. The discoverability expectation has not been fulfilled, but there is still hope that the effort is going to produce fruit. They have been doing the work of pulling everything together for free so far. If we give this a chance and see if more stable funding helps to support platform development, which would then help use. There is also a value to the message of participating at a national level. It is difficult to not know where they were heading. Having roadmaps would be helpful. Getting the stuff needed to be a primary goal; discovery has gotten short shrift. They should have a more robust outreach program by now. There should be a plan for getting the word out to educators. There are some significant issues that need to be addressed.

If we do decide to join, we can make a statement at the same time to let them know we have concerns and what we would like to see. Another concern that was expressed was their diversification, particularly into ebooks, which they are viewing to help fund the core work, but could detract even more from work we're interested in. Our expectations that we would want to see concrete steps to move forward, rather than expecting a lot of increase in traffic. This could be a whitepaper or some other plan. After this year, we would be able to assess the plan and the benefits.

The role of government is to fund things that don't have an immediately visible payback. As a person, we don't want to just pay for nothing, but we take that leap of faith all of the time in the public good.

Hathi Trust was discussed as a parallel. Some large institutions are paying for this to be available to the world.

Vote on DPLA membership

The vote was to participate in the agreement as written, but that we would make a statement articulating what we would like to see and explaining that we would like to reserve the right to terminate as described within the agreement. The group was comfortable with this.

E. Pfothenauer will get clarification that we will only be paying \$10,000 and that we will not owe anything additional for years 2-3. If that is not the case, we will change the agreement to a term of one year. Each member agreed to this plan.

Plan for sharing membership fee

The fee will be divided seven ways, which would be \$1,429 per partner. The group decided this by consensus.

Identify Hub representative for Network Council

The group discussed a representative for the Network Council. They will meet quarterly by phone, with the first meeting in early October. The Network Council will provide oversight to working groups and committees, identify issues for the Advisory Council, and act as a communication group. The person who is on the Network Council does not have to be on the Board. In most cases, it will probably be the primary staff person, as this is primarily day-to-day business. We can decide who will represent us at the Network Council at any time. A. Hanlon would be interested in being part of whichever group, and would be happy to be on the Network Council.

The Advisory Council will meet monthly with DPLA staff. It includes seven hub representatives, and will be by nomination. For this year, individuals can apply and DPLA will select. After this first year, the Network Council will elect the Advisory Council. While it would be a big time commitment, we may want to invest the time to follow-up on the statement we are making. E. Pfothenauer would be interested in being part of it. The Advisory Council is two year terms. There are currently 27 hubs, but only members would be eligible. The group discussed having representation on the Advisory Council. Having someone there seems important, given our statement.

When and how we appoint the Network Council position should be part of our governance documents. When we review the charge and governance documents in November, we will discuss future decision-making about the Network Council.

Review updated Data Exchange Agreement

The Data Exchange Agreement is what we sign in order to contribute our data. The agreement has been updated. The biggest changes are:

- Page 3, Section 2.2: implementing standardized rights statements by the end of calendar year 2018. The group discussed, and felt this would not be possible. E. Pfothenauer will work with them on changing the provision to the end of 2019.
- Section 5: Use of full digital objects. These are additions necessary for IIIF integration. If things are labeled with no copyright, then they won't ask our permission to use them, which seems reasonable. If the data provider has a IIIF endpoint, they agree to share that information. No one had any issues with these provisions.

- Section 7, 2 and 3: There used to be language to say that DPLA would work with the hub to figure out takedown requests or other rights issues. The new language puts the onus on the hub, which seems appropriate. There was concern expressed about the attorney's fees that DPLA could incur.
- Term: The previous one was ongoing; this one would be effective for one year and renewed automatically.

Identify Board chair for 2017-18

L. Konrad has been chair for the last year, and is willing to chair again if no one else is interested, which no one was. L. Konrad will stay for another year.

Other updates

WiLS digital preservation strategic initiative

WiLS is working on a digital preservation strategic initiative, which is designed to explore and understand member needs for digital preservation. There was a survey done this summer, built off the CUWL survey related to this topic. Private colleges, technical collections, and public libraries were surveyed. There will be a summit on August 30 to have a conversation to discuss the survey results and to talk about what it may look like to undertake digital preservation collaboratively. This isn't a hub project, but there is a lot of overlap.

Meeting adjourned 1:01

Next meeting: November 3, Madison