DPLA Service Hub Governing Board
Meeting Notes - October 16, 2015

Location: UW-Milwaukee Digital Humanities Lab

Present: Ewa Barcyk (UW-Milwaukee), Matt Blessing (Wisconsin Historical Society), Ann Hanlon (UW-Milwaukee), Lee Konrad (UW-Madison), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Emily Pfotenhauer (WiLS), Stef Morrill (WiLS), Janice Welburn (Marquette), Gail Murray (DPI\RLLL)

Vote on Marquette joining governing board

M. Blessing made the motion for Marquette to join; C. Markwiese seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Updates on Service Hub milestones

- Data Exchange Agreement has been signed and submitted
- New OAI feed should be up and running in a couple of weeks. DPLA will then review the initial set of data. We will have access to some QA tools to see our data before and after they remediate.
- Metadata workgroup is working on revising metadata guidelines.
- Steering Committee has been researching other hubs and determining policies needed for Recollection Wisconsin. Collection policy, MOU for new content partners, and updated scanning guidelines will be created.
- P. Hedges and E. Pfotenhauer have been going through the collections systematically to make sure collections are ready for ingest into DPLA; e.g. include digital objects and are not data only (like finding aids).

We are on track to have data live in DPLA by the end of January. This data will include what is currently harvested for Recollection Wisconsin and will also include materials from UW-Milwaukee, UW-Madison, and WHS that were outside of the scope of the traditional Recollection Wisconsin scopes (in-state collections, but not about Wisconsin). It will be around 400,000 records, though collections that are data only will be removed. Compound objects will be fine. DPLA does not want individual pages or objects.

Umbra Agreement
A. Hanlon shared the Umbra Agreement with the group. Umbra is a project from the University of Minnesota to aggregate metadata about African-American historical content from multiple institutions, including DPLA. UW-Milwaukee and WHS are already partners, and they are also interested in signing an agreement with the Wisconsin service hub. DPLA data will supersede any data already contributed by individual partners. They are interested in having the other board members as additional partner institutions. E. Pfotenhauer will make the connection between Marquette, UW-Madison, and Milwaukee Public Library and Umbra for them to discuss partnership. They seemed to have overlooked the HBCs (historically black colleges), though many of those institutions may not have digitized collections.

The group discussed if we want to put this type of partnership to a vote. Because the metadata is out there in the world, it may be unnecessary for us to discuss it unless there is a cost to a partnership. E. Pfotenhauer can send a note to the board to ask them and can sign on behalf of Recollection Wisconsin.

Preparing for Phase 2: discussion of in-kind contributions
There are some roles we are already taking on and some we need to do. For example, we will need to educate on rights labeling as soon as it’s available from DPLA.
The group discussed the desire of local historical societies to digitize content. Public libraries are lined up at the door. The local historical societies aren’t as aware of what being part of Recollection Wisconsin can mean, though interest is increasing as people are getting more comfortable with the technology.

When DPLA reviewed the application, they were concerned about the amount of staffing, especially to generate new content. Madison and WHS are doing activities that contribute directly to Phase 1 ingest and will continue. UW-Milwaukee has proposed to offer digitization services for Phase 2 and to bring in smaller partners.

If we are investing in preservation, we have implications that are long past the digitization and the costs will be out of scale. The long-term commitment for preservation may be difficult to an institution.

We may need to put boxes around the content we are adding. We may need goals for specific phases or time periods. We need to have some sense of what resources we need to marshal in a given year. Individuals will have to go through an institution. We may want to focus on getting existing digital collections that are not currently harvestable. For example, there are some that are not OAI compliant, some are not in databases. Getting those into discoverable format is another project.

Road show for schools: power to create digital exhibits, etc. Focusing on education may be good approach for next grants. DPI may have ways to piggyback on what they are already doing to help with that.

DPLA is bringing managers of the service hubs together through a variety of mechanisms: DPLAFest, phone calls, listserv, etc.

**Discussion: Funding ideas**

Overarching themes:

1. Foundation approach
2. Legislative/grassroots approach
3. Cost recovery for service approach
4. Donation/fundraising approach

What are next steps?

1. Emily can share grant applications/letters of inquiry that have already been written. For Milwaukee-based foundations, if the request comes from a Milwaukee institution, it may be more powerful. Delivery of content to classrooms.

2. Strategizing about who we will approach and how the project is presented. Build on existing relationships

3. Donate button on the website would be easy to create. Anything that comes in through that is gravy.

4. Come up with an idea of cost recovery for digitization (UW-Milwaukee, UW-Madison, Marquette, potentially WHS): what are current cost models? Then we will need to field test them.