

## Minnesota Digital Library Coalition

April 23, 2003

Steering Committee meeting

**Attending:** Mike Kathman, Bill DeJohn, John Butler, Wendy Pradt Lougee, Michael Fox, Kristi Tornquist, Daardi Sizemore, Keith Ewing, Christine Clements, Kathleen Flynn, Marian Rengel

### **June 2 Conference planning:**

Review of plans: June 2, Registration starts at 9:30. Conference is 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

MINITEX staff will do registration. Keith is working with MINITEX to develop a registration form to send to lists. Registration deadline will be May 28, 2003.

Discussion followed on ways to reach out to different groups. Suggestions included:

Formal letter to academic library deans and directors

Letter to include in MINITEX publication(s)

Flyer at ADLR (in Duluth, April 25)

MEMO co-chairs and MEMO members

Bill DeJohn reported “running into” a school librarian from Apple Valley who could be very useful to the MDL who said he would be very interested in learning more. Keith Ewing reported having talked with Gary Johnson, the school library media specialist from Dassel, who is also very interested.

Review of the day’s schedule:

9:30 – Registration

10:00 – Opening Speaker, Meg Bellinger, president of OCLC’s Digital Preservation project

11:00 – Kristi Tornquist will give an overview of the MDL Coalition (about 10 minutes)

– Show case current Minnesota Projects

○ U of M Images, system and harvesting aspects

○ MHS Visual Resources

○ Walker’s Arts Connected program for educational possibilities (Who?)

12:00 – 12:45 – Lunch (perhaps working)

1:00 – Survey results, discussion of Signature project, Q&A

Discussion of who to send word of the conference to:

Librarians – Library development list – Bill D can do this

MLA?

MnSCU Pals

MetroNet

Historical Societies (Michael F. can do this)

Suggestions:

We should have a feedback form, evaluation and interest assessment form, do NOT invite vendors, legislators.

Are we going to do packets? Michael F said yes. Bill D. said he’d help.

Packets could include:

Screen shots of the opening pages of the showcase projects

Summary of the survey results  
Handouts from the speakers

Others issues raised:

Is Meg going to discuss architecture in general, governance, resources acquisition and distribution, funding models, interesting things.

Survey and signature project need to be fleshed out before conference.

Do we want to videotape the conference? Conclusion was No.

Do we call it a planning conference or not? (We did already.)

Signature discussion could be half an hour with discussion the second half.

Discussion could open the door for more participation.

Many of the questions attendees ask will come in the signature project.

Lunch could be a discussion lunch, working lunch, round-table.

We might have discussion occur and spread us around at different tables (to capture questions and concerns).

At a minimum we should distribute ourselves and take notes and write up the questions

We could give people paper to write their questions on and then put boxes around the conference into which they can put their questions.

Then we could put the questions and answers on the Web site

(This idea seemed to gain prominence though I have no record of a formal decision – mrr)

Do we want to invite someone from LDS? Yes, Jym should be there and plan to attend.

(Keith E. and Marian Rengel will meet with Jym before May 28.)

(Michael F. will work with Marian R. on funding/paying for this conference.)

### **Training Session in Rochester in late summer**

What's the goal? Metadata and image capture? Signature project? Hands on/lecture? Standards?

Our original plan was capture and metadata.

Kristi T. Our idea in the grant was presented by Chuck. Standards subcommittee took on the standards issue.

Mike Kathman recommended that if it is to be held toward August this session be tied to the signature project.

Discussion followed

Kristi T: It would be linked to LSTA funding.

Keith E: It could involve hardware, software, image standards and metadata models geared toward the signature project.

Michael F: Depending on how tightly bound to the signature project or if it is generally tied.

Are we interested in providing a full range or focus on signature project? There are some nuances here if we're teaching toward the signature project.

Keith E: Based on discussion with Jym W. (from LDS) would like to have LSTA grants fit MDLC standards

Bill D: One approach is to have a general workshop that just focuses on the signature project but not sure we're ready.

Mike K: The earlier we intervene with some standards the better. Which standards? The best we can do is to give people an understanding of what's there so they can choose.

**Motion** to adopt the Western States Digital Standards Group's Digital Imaging Best Practices Version 1.0 for image capture. (Fox/Sizemore). Motion passed on voice vote without dissent.

The workshop, then, will involve these image capture standards.

**Motion** to adopt Western States' Dublin Core Metadata Element Set Version 1.1 for the description of simple/single objects, for instance, photos, posters, paintings, single page documents. (Fox/DeJohn). Motion passed on voice vote without dissent.

### **Survey Results:**

John Butler reported on the preliminary survey results. The frequency report that Marian R. brought to the meeting was for 52 respondents. Another 8 replied but need to be keyed into the database. The 31 online respondents are being tallied.

There were a lot of questions with no responses. 7.7% of respondents have digital collections online; 46% are considering doing so, 23% are not considering online, and only 4 % have collections online, though this disagrees with the 7.7% for another question. There seems to be a lot of interest, but there are probably a lot of questions.

Asked respondents to profile collections. 36.5% said they had photo collections they wanted converted. 25% said they had text collections. 49 people did not even respond to the question about metadata, suggesting they don't know what metadata is. Low numbers on capture, depth, storage questions.

There's a lot of mining that can be done here.

On the question on LSTA interest, 23% are interested; 19% said no, 19% said maybe, 17% said "what's LSTA?" and 21% said nothing.

Reactions followed:

Kristi T: We're not ready to use the survey to do a signature project.

John B: We'll want to look at what's really here.

Mike K: It confirms our sense that there's much greater interest than knowledge.

Christine C: Do we have criteria that we would like the project to be based on?

Discussion of signature project lead to with the recommendation that the survey team (Butler, Sizemore, Ewing, Rengel) review the survey information using these collections criteria:

- A Minnesota Connection
- Out of copyright
- Simple images (not databases)
- Something someone might want/reputable/useful
- Things that are extensible – technically and organizationally
- Content – may be revealed by survey results.

### **Wendy L's revised document: Minnesota Digital Library, Revised Draft Framework 4/18/03**

Discussion: Several people recommended proofreading changes.

Groups agreed that the goals were appropriate.

Framework for signature project:

*Content identification and Development* is underway or done

*Information Retrieval and Management* needs discussion

A small group needs to flesh this out. This is also the task for which we will be asking for money for help.

*Content Capture and Description* will need a group to discuss and develop, needs guidance. Wendy L will work out a “for instance” work flow plan.

Discussion of location of MDL: The server could possibly be housed at U of M, but the services could be at MINITEX for example. We need infrastructure to support the development of MDL.

*Governance* needs discussion and information from Jym Wroblewski.

**Feedback from John Wilkin:**

Wendy L. will send that to members.

**Next Meeting:**

Date: May 28 10 a.m. to noon

Location: Conference Call

June 2: This planning committee will also meet for one hour after the June 2 conference at MHS for “debriefing.”

Butler, Ewing, Sizemore and Rengel will meet May 8 with staff at SCSU who conducted the survey.