

Minnesota Digital Library Coalition

March 21, 2003 Meeting of
Executive/Policy & Planning committees
Minutes

Attending: Mike Kathman, Bill DeJohn, John Butler, Eric Celeste, Michael Fox, Kristi Tornquist, Daardi Sizemore, Keith Ewing, Christine Clements, Kathleen Flynn

Guest: Marian Rengel

June 2 Conference planning:

M. Fox reported:

- 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. in the Auditorium at the Minnesota Historical Society in St. Paul.
- Registration will begin at 9:30 a.m.
- Planning on 125 people attending. We will provide boxed lunches for them (\$1,445)
- Auditorium has Internet connection and there are two rooms available for lunch.

Discussion, suggestions, and ideas followed

Do we want to invite vendors? No

Do we want to discuss the signature project? Yes

M. Fox: OCLC is willing to help us frame the discussion by sharing information on what's going on in other states.

Possible content points are

- 1) Building enthusiasm/setting groundwork. Why we're interested in pursuing this project. Why this is important to Minnesota, models for accomplishing MDLC goal.
- 2) What's happening on the Minnesota scene. What is MDLC? Current projects underway in Minnesota that relate to MDLC focus? LSTA as funding source?
- 3) Signature project.

Who do we want to invite? People with collections.

It would also be exciting to have an exciting speaker.

K. Tornquist: one goal is to get people to sign up to help with MDLC. J. Butler: what we do with them after they sign up? K. Ewing: for him the goal is doing something at the conference to show people why they want to sign up. ... E. Celeste: one outcome of the conference could be for institutions to sign on to the concept of the coalition.

Discussion turned to the signature project

E. Celeste suggested that we present the results of the survey to the people attending the conference and say "You've told us this. ... It looks like what you want is to do _____. Do you want to join us or critique us?" People and their institutions could choose from two levels of connecting: 1) get into the signature project or 2) be a part of MDLC. J. Butler suggested we need a tangible outcome, a commitment, at least letters of support to the grant.

M. Kathman saw three audiences: 1) people interested in the signature project, 2) people who want to know what's going on 3) people who have done digitization that we want involved. K. Tornquist suggested: 4) groups who did digitization on the fly and need guidelines.

K. Flynn: it would be fruitful to restate who we see as the audience.

K. Tornquist: it would be helpful in the invitations to say "here are the people we think might be useful to come." We might want to invite some legislators.

Demonstrations: U of M and MHS will demonstrate some of their digitization projects that illustrate the goals and objectives of MDLC.

M. Rengel: invite a K-12 teacher who has used these collections, perhaps applied them in a way the MDLC envisions its collection being used. E. Celeste questioned area of emphasis for demonstrations: 1) capturing the image 2) storing it 3) sharing it so people have access. M. Kathman recommended demonstrations that tap into preserving culture. M. Fox: if you're going to build enthusiasm, its for cultural heritage or education; capture and preservation are underlying concepts, essential but behind the scenes.

B. DeJohn suggested that our audience might be the same as the audience of Minnesota History Day.

Metadata Training Sessions

Discussions are still underway for metadata training sessions to be held in Rochester in late summer. **Goal:** That people leave training with a better understanding of why metadata are important. K. Ewing pointed out that the idea was that this training session would be a prototype of what the MDLC would do on a regular basis. D. Sizemore: this training would stress why we think standards are important, what standards already exist, explain the ones the MDLC recommends.

M. Fox: before this training session can take place, two things have to happen: we're being required to develop standards and we have to present those standards. M. Fox, E. Celeste and Jason Roy (MHS) are working on reviewing standards and preparing recommendations to the group. M. Kathman: we need a good turnkey program. M. Fox: we need to outline the landscape of standards.

Survey update

M. Rengel and D. Sizemore reported. Paper surveys had been sent out. 25+ had returned. Web survey was up and had received 3. Survey was scheduled to be available until April 4 but we will leave a time cushion for latecomers.

Budget status

M. Rengel reported that we have spent 23 percent of current LSTA planning budget. We still have a balance of \$38,436. Of that \$17,109.76 is encumbered for personnel. (That leaves \$21,326.24 to spend on the June 2 Conference, summer metadata training, other activities.)

So far, the budget needs for the June 2 Conference are

- Lunch
- Tech Services
- Advertising
- Printing
- Supplies
- Speaker fees
- Broadcast/put on Web site

The committee also suggested creating something that people could take away from the conference, like a CD with samples on it

Budget for Training

E. Celeste and J. Roy will work on this

Standards to LSTA

We need to address: Metadata, Technical, Intellectual property, Operations

E. Celeste: are some tools available? K. Ewing: digitization and preservation and access are two different things. J. Butler: We need to consider contractual arrangements. K. Tornquist: we need a process. M. Fox: All are done! (by someone) With our response to LSTA we need to say, “Here’s what we’re coming up with in scanning the landscape as Best Practices. In the realm of the things that are out there, these are the ones that we have determined as best practices.” ... We will use the implementation process to see if these work.

B. DeJohn: We have a standards task force in the state – advisory group to LDS. “I would want to bring back what we come up with to that committee.”

K. Tornquist: Is it possible that we could roll out the standards at the June 2 meeting? M. Fox: Could we by June 2 prepare a PowerPoint? Yes we could. ... We walk the walk cuz as we develop the signature project we will use these. K. Tornquist: we could tell this group, here’s what we’re working on and here’s the process it’s going to go through. E. Celeste: and make a requirement for any grant they participate in a workshop.

M. Fox volunteered that he, E Celeste and J. Roy will meet and look at all available standards, pick their favorites and send them to the listserv, or they will e-mail all members of this committee. At the June 2 conference they will present a PowerPoint of the results. ... We will use the signature project to test and validate.

M. Kathman: the next grant could ask for the equipment to store and the vendor to capture images.

MDLC is willing to certify if LSTA digitization grant proposals meet these standards.

Infrastructure Grant/Signature project

K. Ewing: need money to support training, money for annual conference to showcase what we’re working on. B DeJohn: Do we want money for buying a server? C. Clement: I don’t think we want to move infrastructure and signature project together. Will we have a signature project by

June 2? D. Sizemore: the signature project – pick a type to digitize, pick a focus, based on what people have in their collections. M. Fox: there are issues surrounding delivery of text all very different from delivering things – from a researcher’s point of view. Trying to do both would be very hard. J. Butler: On technical implementation we want to start simple.

John P. Wilkin report

None. E. Celeste did not go with W. Lougee when she drove Wilkin to the airport

W. Lougee’s document “Minnesota Digital Library: A Signature Project for Action

E. Celeste asked if anyone sees the MDLC clearly. M. Kathman, K. Ewing and M. Rengel volunteered their images.

Comments:

- Basic difference between primary and secondary resources.
- Does the intended use influence how you build this?
- Is there a way that knowledge can be shared?
- Can you create public commentary to share?
- Someone creates something more substantive.
- As the user takes the object, what is the intellectual property?
- There would be more than an image in the collection, but that would allow for commentary. That could be essential to this project.
- A place where you can put in knowledge, where you would have people go in to create a commentary.
- One aspect is that every amateur is an expert.
- It enriches that document.
- Capturing is going to be easiest.

Final Check:

- April 2 – M. Fox, K Ewing, W. Lougee, J. Roca and representative from OCLC will have a phone conference to plan details for June 2 conference.
- K Ewing will work on response to W. Lougee’s “straw man” document. C. Clements will work with W. Lougee to modify it into two documents.
- E Celeste and M. Fox will develop demonstration of U of M and MHS digitization projects to present at June 2 conference
- E. Celeste and J. Roy will develop a budget for the summer metadata training workshop.
- M. Fox, E. Celeste and J. Roy look at all available standards, pick their favorites and send them to the listserv, or they will e-mail all members of this committee. They will develop a presentation for the June 2 conference.

Next meeting of Executive and Planning and Policy committees: Wednesday, April 23, 2003, at MINITEX.

Minutes (prepared by M. Rengel)

Notes from GIANT Post-Its

#1

Heritage/Education

1. bldg enthusiasm/what's possible/what's happening in other states

Keynote

Possibility for K-12

2. Minnesota Scene

LSTA

MDLC

Training

Governance

Standards

3. Signature project

Survey results

Committees/workgroups

Recruit for standards/metadata training

Signature project + standards for LSTA?

#2

Standards

Eric, Jason & Michael will pick their favorites before the conference

At the conference will provide an overview

At same time will send thru Bill's & Mike's standards committee

Standards committee makes decision & gives to Jym (Wroblewski at LDS)

Write grant to LSTA for

Signature project that includes standards

Use signature project to text and validate

#3

MDL certifies if LSTA digital grant proposals:

1) Are technically feasible

2) Meet standards

“Better” projects would have attended workshops

Next grant proposal

1. Platform or

2. Approve vendors

Infrastructure grant – workshops, annual conference to showcase results (Minerva), central servers

Signature project grant.