MEETING NOTES
DPLA Service Hub Governing Board
Conference Call – April 2, 2015 9:00am

Present:
Matt Blessing, Wisconsin Historical Society
Ryan Claringbole, Department of Public Instruction
Ann Hanlon, UW-Milwaukee
Lee Konrad, UW-Madison
Emily Pfotenhauer, WiLS (staff/ex offico)
Stef Morrill, WiLS

Absent:
Cathy Markwiese, Milwaukee Public Library

1) Review and approve draft document of charge/statement of purpose for Board

M. Blessing expressed concern that this opportunity might be immensely popular once it gets out. When another institution wants to join, do we need formal bylaws? We have talked about the channels for participation. We could add a note to that effect to the informal document. People with the in-kind contributions would be part of this group; the Steering Committee would be the more general group for statewide participation.

Are there other models where community members are contributors in governance? One example is the Wisconsin Public Library Consortium. There is a governing board and a committee that focuses on operations of the digital collection.

There are multiple channels for people to get content in, with distributed repositories. Governing is not really “top down” but instead very distributed by the nature of the way we have formed our infrastructure and work so far.

At this early stage, is it possible to keep the structure and documentation relatively informal, with the caveat that we may need to add formality as things develop? Do we try this and evaluate? We want to be open to rethinking things, but we need to get some traction to determine how best to do it. We start informally and then evaluate and potentially develop something more formally down the road.

We will use this model through Phase 1 and then we will review and adjust as appropriate. E. Pfotenhauer will change the charge/purpose to reflect this more explicitly.

To clarify the budget: WiLS will be the fiscal agent and will prepare the annual budget in conjunction with the board. They carry out the budget ( invoicing and paying bills as appropriate) and will provide monthly or quarterly updates to the board.

Discussion on bullet point 4: What qualifies as a strategic partnership?

• The board is focused on the partnership; the steering committee focuses on the collections.
• What do we call our partners that contribute data vs. the partners that are contributing more? “Contributing partners” vs. “Managing partners”?

The group agreed that we will keep meeting procedure informal at this time. We will develop more formal procedures as needed.

E. Pfotenhauer will revisit the document and will revise as discussed and send to the group for official approval.

2) Select Board chair

E. Pfotenhauer is viewing her role as the staff liaison to this project. The group agreed that Emily should be ex officio to the board. A. Hanlon volunteered so the group agreed that she will serve as the chair for the first year.

3) Review and approve draft documents of charge/statement of purpose for Steering Committee and Metadata Work Group

The group discussed the Steering Committee document.

The Steering Committee is acting on 1, 4, and 6, of the DPLA Service Hub expectations (http://dp.la/info/service-hub-application/):

1. Representing their community (state, region, etc.) as the point of contact for DPLA and obtaining community buy-in on significant issues affecting their partners.
2. Aggregating their partners’ metadata into a single standard and sharing it with DPLA through one harvestable data source.
3. Actively addressing metadata concerns (including copyright and licensing labeling) and working with partners on timely remediation.
4. 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.
5. Maintaining technologies (such as OAI-PMH, API, ResourceSync, etc.) that allow for standardized metadata to be shared with the DPLA on a regular, consistent basis.
6. Engaging with the broader community of data creators, providers, and users, locally and nationally.

The Steering Committee intent is to have statewide, “boots on the ground” representation. As with the board document, it will be an informal document for the first phase. E. Pfotenhauer will add some language indicating that this document is for phase 1 and will be revisited.

The group discussed the phrase “practicing professionals.” The key is that people are actively interested and involved in this space. There may be volunteers or others who could be interested. The group thought that “digital library practitioners” may be more inclusive of those who could serve on this body.

Some of the language came from the Empire State Digital Network, the New York DPLA service hub project. Having a conference call with the Steering Committee and one of these established hubs may be beneficial.

The group discussed the initial membership of the Steering Committee. The group was comfortable with the proposed members, as they are fairly representative, and felt that
targeting individuals that we know are capable to help us establish the project is appropriate. As the project moves forward, we can revisit how members are identified and/or appointed.

The group discussed the size of the committee. There are 11 people on the list so far. 13 may be difficult to manage on phone calls. We will revisit the size of the group after Phase 1 is complete.

We want to have some continuity, so we will draw lots for the first term limits and will reappoint as desired after the term. The group will appoint their own chair.

Overall, the group felt that the document provides for a strong and enabled steering committee that functions independently of the board but works in conjunction with the board.

The group discussed the Metadata Work Group Draft document.

This group is meant to be short term and will be doing concentrated work on reviewing metadata and help with developing a process for metadata review for new data partners. The process will need to be efficient so that we can handle adding data partners in a timely way that isn’t too burdensome for anyone. The group will also address policies about adding new data. A SLIS student is currently evaluating current data so that the metadata workgroup will have a good sense of what already exists.

There were no changes proposed to the document.

The makeup of the group will not be geographically representative because of the limited number of metadata professionals in the state. Because it is a working group that is very focused on a specific topic, the geographic representation is not needed.

4) Review and approve appointments to Steering Committee and Metadata Work Group Preliminary list

The group discussed the appointments during the review of the charges above.

5) Funding update

E. Pfotenhauer has had conversations with partners and there have been more in-kind contributions. UW-Milwaukee is exploring the idea of doing digitization support for cultural heritage institutions in the area. UW-Madison SLIS is interested in incorporating digital library experiences for students, which could include having a standing digital libraries practicum opportunity and creating metadata for smaller institutions that would not have the capacity to create metadata on their own.

A number of the public library systems in the state have begun to implement digitization programs for their members. These programs vary by region, and may not be coordinating efforts. The group felt that doing these things at scale and in collaboration is the way to go. Digitizing things is easy; educating people about how to do this in sustainable ways is critical. It’s important not to develop too many silos. This may be part of the communication and outreach role for the Steering Committee and Board. The museum community may be a greater
void that we need to fill in terms of best practices, etc. The time is ripe for addressing this. Some of the regional systems are planning to work with the museum and local historical societies, so it may be a good opportunity to do this education. There are real investments and risks, and if we can help with background and planning would be beneficial. L. Konrad offered UW-Madison to help with preservation education as an additional in-kind contribution. R. Claringbole offered tools available through DPI. S. Morrill and E. Pfotenhauer will meet with him soon.

The WISELearn funding was not included in the state budget and it is not clear if there will be additional WISELearn funding in the future.

While there isn’t a lot of LSTA money, the LSTA advisory committee meeting is next Tuesday. There is an open meeting presentation timeslot. Someone could come and make an informal presentation on how LSTA funds could contribute toward this project. DPI cannot make this recommendation, but if someone else could come and pitch it, there could be LSTA funds for it, perhaps $30,000-$50,000 if the LSTA committee felt it would be appropriate.

6) Communication plan

E. Pfotenhauer would like to start posting updates to the Recollection Wisconsin website. She would like to share the minutes from the meetings and the working plan and timeline. The group is comfortable with this as long as there is the opportunity to review prior to the meeting.

There are some presentations coming up at WAAL and WAPL to explain DPLA and what we are doing in the state. There will also be a DPLA update at the WiLS Peer Council meeting in early June.

E. Pfotenhauer will continue to share documents through our Google folder and will email the group between meetings with questions and updates about the project and DPLA in general.

7) Next meeting

The next quarterly meeting will be in July. The group expressed a preference to meet in early July. It is good timing, given the DPLA application will be due around that time.