Recollection Wisconsin DPLA Service Hub
Governing Board Quarterly Meeting
January 22, 2016

Board members present: Matt Blessing (WHS), Ryan Claringbole (DPI), Ann Hanlon (UW-Milwaukee), Scott Mandernack (Marquette), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Stef Morrill (WiLS), Cat Phan (proxy for Lee Konrad, UW-Madison)

Others present: Emily Pfotenhauer, WiLS (Staff liaison)

1. DPLA Partnership update
   - Thanks, as always, to Emily, for being the glue!
   - Steering Committee has developed two documents that we will review for onboarding new partners in the next phase. They are also developing a communications strategy for DPLA announcement as well as in future phases. A workgroup is working on that: Liz Kaune (MPL), Abbi Nye (UW-Milwaukee), Dorothea Salo (UW-Madison SLIS), Melissa Mclimans (WiLS). Developing pre-prepared language to send out ahead of time to content partners.
   - UW-Madison is continuing to develop data harvester. The timeline for that has been pushed back several times. It’s “imminent” with production server ready with data sets on it, the harvester is working, and they are waiting for a firewall to be opened up. UWDC collections are up and SDG is now working on adding the Recollection Wisconsin collections. Once DPLA has access to the feed, then they need 4-5 weeks and then there will be a little time to do some QA on the data. If we can get things on the production server in the next couple of weeks, we would anticipate going live in early April. DPLAFest is April 14-15, and that will be the opportunity to be on board and show the data. We were originally shooting for onboard in February.
   - All partners did some basic cleanup and remapping to clean up the data as much as possible. We won’t need what else may need to be modified until DPLA lets us know.
   - The goal is to harvest all of the existing partners of Recollection Wisconsin: primarily what’s in CONTENTdm and the UWDC collections. Handful of stuff in other platforms that will hopefully make it in by February, but may need more time for metadata cleanup. Milwaukee Public Museum won’t be harvested in the first round because they are having OAI issues, but expect them to be ready to go for Round 2. There isn’t a timeline for Round 2 yet. There will be a refresh schedule once Round 1 is scheduled. The maximum for adding content is every two months, but it will more likely be quarterly.
   - It was requested that UW-Madison give partners a heads up before they harvest, as some of them are updating metadata right now.
   - QA tool from DPLA allows us to look at the metadata ahead of time. More details will be coming soon.
   - Emily is now on the “all hubs” email list, and they just announced yesterday that January 27th is the “all hubs quarterly update” conference call. Sent to Ann Hanlon and Paul Hedges and Peter Gorman, and others could sit in if they would like.
   - Is Steering Committee contacting the major media outlets for the big announcement? Press release will be developed but looking to partners with media contacts. Melissa is going to speak to UW-Madison GLS communications person (Natasha). Cat will talk to her, too. As they develop press releases, identifying people who would give quotes.
- How much does board want to be in communications effort?
  - Would be happy to review communications.
  - Resource for locating people for quotes, etc.: The Steering Committee will develop an "ask" package.
- Amy Rudersdorf is leaving DPLA as of February 1. Going to AV Preserve. We were lucky to get started while she was there. Got the ball rolling for us! They will be rehiring her position right away.
- Milwaukee PL sent partnership letter back to Umbra. It’s meant to be an endorsement and that we are aware.

2. Review draft service hub consulting service program document (UWM and MU)

- Very draft at this point!
- Focusing on more of a consulting model as opposed to digitization services. Training to some extent. Help them identify vendors to outsource digitization, and will go on a case-by-case.
- Help them do an RFP or assessing responses from vendors and also quality control when it comes back.
- One pilot project in place: working with the Shorewood Historical Society with a small collection they have that will be hosted on MPL CONTENTdm instance. They already have the materials digitized, so Ann spent about six hours with them doing metadata consultations and discussion of copyright issues. Two in-person meetings with them. All volunteers. Hoping to use them as a model.
- Another idea is help locate students who can do paid internship or field work and act as a liaison. Local folks to work from UW-Milwaukee. Takes a lot of time and that would be valuable contribution. Milwaukee PL uses field work students in their digitization network. See them putting the projects on resumes and it will be a desirable experience for them. Museum Studies at UW-M would be great. Marquette has public history students and others.
- Who they will be helping?
  - Need to define region carefully.
  - Fee schedule is needed
  - May want to have virtual options as well or travel be on the people
  - Sounds a little like the Wisconsin Archives Mentoring Service at UW-Oshkosh, which was pulled back due to lack of interest from small organizations.
  - When a local historical society realizes the amount of work, they may back away. And the long-term cost of digital storage.
  - Larger question: mentoring advice about permanent preservation.
  - Ann might talk to Josh Ranger at UW-Oshkosh about the WAMS model.
  - Preservation piece and who will take responsibility is an open question and a bigger question and an important question. When WHS archivists give presentations, the archival sessions always fill up faster. It’s a new crop of volunteers each three years. It’s a fresh pool and a new crop of users. With preservation of digital masters, there is issues with continuity because of the turnover. May need to look to larger institutions to take that responsibility and who will take on that responsibility as people are being hit with cuts to resources. Have to address it anyway.
- Two things on the table:
  - Geography: keep it small, perhaps the area.
  - How do we deal with rural, northern areas?
● Original service is coming under the statewide service hub.
● Hub is having the bigger picture and where we are weak and build it up.
  ▪ Part of what the service hub does. Active partners in Milwaukee with expertise. Developing enhanced support for those institutions in the area. Leverage other partner’s experience. Building on an existing service model.

○ Where are the digital masters?
  ▪ The model has been that the individual organization is responsible and here are some guidelines. It’s not an ideal model but it’s what we have the resources to do right now.
  ▪ Allowed us to move forward.

○ Has to be some boundary established. If the requests come through Recollection Wisconsin, then perhaps the boundaries don’t matter as much. Having it go through RW would help with filtering out people and getting people who are ready to Marquette and UW-M

○ This is a pilot. What are the questions we need to address?
  ▪ Geography: how do we start seeding expertise in other areas? How can we deal with people far away? Maybe don’t explicitly state a geographic boundary.
  ▪ Part of it is making potential participants understanding the process.
  ▪ Better to start through RW.
  ▪ Maybe criteria is interest in participating in DPLA.
  ▪ Explicitly state a pilot project.

○ Maybe we write a more general public facing piece?

○ Interns would be paid by the institution getting the service or grant funding.

○ For this board’s interest, do we want to think about selection and appraisal? If we discover gaps, do we want to go out and seek collections?
  ▪ Sort of a resource dependent thing. Do we go out and recruit? Could be a source of funding.

○ Whose call are the priorities?
  ▪ The service hub is the “onramp to participate”. It’s up to the local level to decide what to digitize. Expectation is that the owning institution is going to be 90% of the labor once the consultation part is done. They will need to want it.

○ Add word “consulting” to the “digitization services” piece in the first sentence.

○ Ann and Scott will revise and send back our way for more discussion!

● Preservation is a big problem we will have to discuss. Once place to look for models is DPLA service hubs. We keep saying this is a big question that needs to be addressed, even beyond DPLA.

● When we did the session with South Carolina, it seemed like most of the activity and the expertise for their service hub comes out of the university. A lot of the universities participate in that kind of institutional preservation exchanges. They have agreements with LOCKSS networks, etc. and that may be why we are struggling with this more – less academic perspective.

3. Review draft Collection Policy and MOU for new partners (Steering Committee)
• Steering committee has been charged with developing documents and board has final approval.
• Intent is to have agreement be as minimal as possible.
• Newspapers are excluded?
  o WPLC is ramping up a pilot that won’t be harvested.
  o If we are only harvesting metadata, and the issues will be identical.
  o They will ingest, but it’s not really helpful for the end user to have it.
  o The transcripts are not metadata for DPLA. It would be nice if it were, but its not at this point.
  o We’ve always resisted hosting it because there is so much content.
  o One work around would be to have title level records in the DPLA collection.
  o UWDC has title level metadata records for journals: one record for multiple issues
  o RW currently has legacy student newspaper collections and Marquette and UW-M are working on it.
  o If you want to make title-level records, how would you do that? Emily will check and make sure DPLA is okay with that. Needs to point to content.
  o NDNP content at LC – not currently in DPLA, but it sounds like something they are considering. There is Knight Foundation grant to work on that.
  o Will revisit this in the future.
  o Perhaps take it out and reserve the right? Or leave it in and take out the “at the individual issue or page level” level.
• More clear on removal.
• Add language about stability in #8.
• Another point of discussion from Steering Committee: The first bullet point “Digital collections should support the educational...”. It’s to support our state and not about Wisconsin. It may be relevant to other audiences but the intent is to support the intent of the needs of Wisconsin. Everyone was okay with the vague statement.
• Do we want a review schedule on the policy? Yes, and let’s make it annual to start.
• With the MOU, the requirements apply, but we aren’t expecting existing partners to sign. What if an existing partner has a new collection? Does it matter? Is that an opportunity to have you sign the “fun new document”? There was an MOU a long time ago that intimidated some organizations and we abandoned it at some point. Should we send out and at least notify the partners? With an opt out?
• Should probably add something about not preserving these materials and that they are responsible. Perhaps add in the last paragraph between the 2 sentences?
• Removal policy was borrowed from North Carolina. There will be times that individual objects will be removed. Does this cover that? As long as we have a mechanism in place to deal with it. It would have to be removed from the content providers collection. Content providers may have to have something in their policy to let people know that there will be a lag.
• Emily will go back to the Steering Committee with the revisions. The board doesn’t need to see it again.

4. Review and discuss funding strategy
• Started conversation at last meeting
• Emily and Stef drafted
• Two area that are most promising: Foundation and Legislative/grassroots approach
• Legislative/grassroots approach could include community funding
- Foundations
  - Asking for specific projects or operational costs?
    - May depend on the foundation – if they want a more formal proposal on a project or just sit down and talk about the program.
  - Is it more patience or perseverance?
    - It depends on the foundation. If there’s a relationship, probably would have a different strategy.
    - Get a lot of requests and don’t want to hear from you
  - Others on the list we have not yet approached.
    - Maybe asks should be coming from the consortial level?
      - In many cases, be fine, but we should check powers that be.
      - Could list institutions on the board on the letterhead
      - Information gathering and feed to Emily. What to know – what is their process and timeline and specific deadlines?
- WPLC angle
  - Given a grant to develop training materials and some other things – exploring grant opportunities and open ended question about where it goes from there.
  - They are also interested in the digital preservation question.
  - Two public library systems have already collaborated on a shared storage platform.

5. DPLAFest
- In DC. April 14-15. Ann and Emily will be attending.
- Today is the deadline for submitting proposals. Going to submit a proposal for a lightning round for the service hubs. Ann will present on the pilot and the group was happy with the topic.
- The day before the Fest starts is a session on the rights work they have been doing for the hubs. Each hub has two slots to attend the all-day working group.

6. Scheduling out quarterly meetings
- April meeting: May 6th in Milwaukee. DPLAFest and consortia review process, charge of board, partnership agreements
- July meeting: July 22 in Madison (GEF 3). New chair
- October meeting: November 4 in Milwaukee
- All meetings will be 10am – 1pm.