NOTES Recollection Wisconsin DPLA Service Hub Governing Board Quarterly Meeting

Friday, May 13th from 10:00am - 12:00pm

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Steering Committee updates
 - a) Welcome to Steven Rice, Door County Historical Museum Chair-Elect, Board liaison, and new DPLA Network Council representative
 - b) Updates on discussions around harmful content statements and the use of prison labor in digitization
 - i) The question of creating an RW-specific harmful content statement to be displayed on our collection site in place of the DPLA one. The Committee didn't feel that we needed to write a new statement - the DPLA one expresses all we would want to express - but that we should be explicit about endorsing that statement and giving guidance to users on what to do if they have a concern and begin a conversation to help content partners to think about having their own statements.
 - The prison labor question. RW should discourage the use of prison labor in digitization projects and create guidance for collection owners that (kindly) provides some education, reasoning behind the recommendation, and alternatives for digitization services.
- 3) Update on advocacy activities
 - a) Working group with John Chrastka/EveryLibrary
 - Talking about strategies to raise visibility and awareness of Recollection Wisconsin, thinking beyond the typical folks we advocate with. The first meeting was in February and a follow-up meeting was held this Tuesday.
 - ii) The plan is to start with a power map, mapping out the key people in the landscape, from which a strategy will be developed. The Board will be kept updated about where those conversations are going and be asked to provide input.
 - b) Library Development & Legislation (LD&L) committee meeting on May 20
 - LD&L is a key stakeholder group, they have been a key advocate for Recollection WI in the past. We'll be meeting with them next week to share general information about the program and make the case for continued support.
 - ii) It was asked who the Recollection WI champions on LD&L might be and if it's worth cultivating them.
- 4) Sustainability planning

We will use this FY23 "bridge year" as an opportunity to design a more diversified and sustainable funding strategy, while also continuing to advocate for state funding in the

next budget biennium. Before the meeting, please review the draft planning process and timeline (linked below). The first step in the proposed process is to gather information from RW content partners and stakeholders this spring re: core consortium activities (see draft survey linked below).

- a) Review and approve proposed sustainability planning process and timeline
 - The timeline looks good with regards to the renewal of the RW and MPL MOU and additional support that could be provided by MPL.
 - ii) State funding would be complementary to whatever model is developed through this process, giving RW a more diversified funding portfolio.
 - iii) This process aims to figure out the actual costs of the essential pieces of the program. The DPLA membership currently is funded by the Governing Board institutions but a new model might be discovered through the planning process. A RW membership model is one that's on the table, but not necessarily the final route for funding the core services of RW.
 - iv) Timeline concerns: This process kicks off at the beginning of the fiscal year so ample time will be needed to communicate any changes to organizations
 - v) The Pillar approach is useful in prioritizing to focus on core services
 - vi) It should be noted that WiLS does not assume that WiLS will be the primary or sole service provider for RW.
- b) Review and discuss draft prioritization survey
 - This survey will be shared with stakeholders content partners and Steering Committee members - to understand the essential components of the RW program; the data will be aggregated and shared with the Board to provide feedback in August. WiLS' consulting team will be working with us to arrive at models / scenarios to consider.
 - ii) Q5: Might not capture the amount of contribution an org can make to digital collections work. How can we ask that question differently so we gather the info we need.
 - (1) Adequacy question: rate current involvement and org investment in digital collections activities (adequate, inadequate)
 - (2) Barriers: what keeps orgs from participating more fully in digital collections work? Or what are the aspirations for your digital collections in a perfect world.
 - (3) Is digital collections work a priority for your organization?
 - (4) Do you manage digital assets locally? How many digital assets do you manage? How many collections? Etc. would get to at the scale problem.
 - iii) Concern about asking orgs that can't afford to add another fee in their budgets, generally, also if the fee goes up but orgs get less service

- a) FY22 YTD budget
 - i) Recommended additional expenditures related to use of private foundation grants and ARPA funds
 - ii) There is no carryover to FY23 and ARPA funds cannot be carried over
 - iii) MPL is working with city to see if CDM costs can be covered by ARPA
- b) Draft FY23 budget
 - i) Reminder of FY23 as bridge/planning year -Temporary reductions to project management
- 6) MoU with WiLS for FY23

WiLS acts as the fiscal sponsor for the Recollection Wisconsin consortium by lending its 501(c)(3) status to receive funds from federal and state grantmaking agencies as well as private foundations on behalf of RW. This arrangement needs to be formalized in writing. After bringing the Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement to the Board last year, WiLS has consulted an attorney and has suggestions for how to move this forward (see Executive Summary, linked below). Jennifer Chamberlain, WiLS Executive Director, will be present to answer questions about fiscal sponsorship.

- a) Review annual consortial management MoU
 - It was clarified that in the past, the Chair has signed on behalf of the Board; Ann will take this to her legal team with the Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement. The Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement will need to be resolved before the MoU can be signed.
 - MoUs are not signed annually between Governing Board members and RW/WiLS; in 2016 the Board members signed the charter as an agreement to participate.
 - iii) MoUs are signed with Board orgs that make an in-kind contribution, like UW-Madison and MPL
- b) Review and discuss Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement
 - i) Executive Summary of the agreement
 - ii) Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement
 - iii) Resolution on signing approval (sample)
 - (1) Concerns that RW is not an entity so the Governing Partners have reservations about signing. While orgs may have their own rules, WiLS' attorney advised that this agreement's purpose is to ensure that everyone is clear about the fiscal sponsorship and that money spent is spent in accordance with the agreement. RW itself can determine who has the authority to sign, taking into consideration rules that individual orgs operate under. The Board members all expressed concern about having the signing authority to sign this agreement. Governing Board Partners will seek out legal counsel from their own teams.
 - (2) It was clarified that fiscal activities on behalf of the consortium are completed as WiLS, not Recollection Wisconsin.

- (3) It is our understanding that someone needs to be able to sign on behalf of the consortium but not everyone needs to sign. Typically this has been the Chair.
- c) Approve MoU and Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement
- 7) Annual policy review asynchronously over email following the meeting
 - a) <u>Collection Policy</u>
 - b) <u>Copyright Policy</u>
 - c) Governing Board Charter
 - i) Was reviewed and no comments were shared during the meeting

2022 MEETING SCHEDULE

- August extra meeting, a facilitated planning session to work on the sustainable funding plan.
- September joint meeting of Board and Steering Committee (date and location TBD)
 More details will be coming soon
- November 4, 2022 (virtual)