

Minnesota Digital Library Coalition

Steering Committee Meeting

December 12, 2003

MINUTES

Attending: Kristi Tornquist, Wendy Pradt Lougee, Kathleen Flynn, Bill DeJohn, Jason Roy, Keith Ewing, Mike Kathman, Marian Rengel, Eric Celeste, Michael Fox, John Butler, Daardi Sizemore, Joan Roca

Kristi Tornquist called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. Location: MINITEX conference room, Elmer L. Andersen Library at the U of M.

Agenda items

LSTA FY2002 Round 1 grant report

Marian R. distributed copies of a draft of the final report. Changes/suggestions should go to Keith E. or Marian. John B. explained that the U of M was very close to completing negotiations to with Oracle and that IMAGES would most likely not convert to OpenSource.

LSTA FY 2002 Round 2 grant

Marian distributed drafts of the final report for the Stearns History Center/SCSU digitization project.

LSTA FY 2003 grant

Review Award

MDLC received the FY 2003 LSTA grant for \$299,983.56. SCSU, as fiscal agent, has signed all copies. We are awaiting the return of the fully signed contract from LDS. Spending can begin either January 15, 2004, or when we receive the signed copies, which ever is later.

Marian reviewed the budget for that grant (Funding is for 18 months).

Personnel: Keith as project director, 20 days – \$10,221 (Match – additional 20 days)
Grant coordinator (currently Marian) 40 days – \$13,347 (Match – additional \$6,673)

Administrative expenses – \$11,533

Automation Hardware: for Minnesota Historical Society – \$5,000

Automation Software: for MHS – \$1,864

Supplies: DVDs – \$1,000

Meetings – \$2,900

Contractual: Project director – \$90,000

Minnesota Reflections (digitization) – \$40,725

Infrastructure development (U of M) – \$34,890

Web development – \$9,983

Web presence (historical essays) – \$3,000

Complex Digital Objects (MHS) – \$21,800

End-use (K-12) collaboration – \$17,750

MDLC Steering Committee minutes for 12/12/03

Other: Mileage – \$9,183
Lodging – \$6,203
Food – \$16,371
Parking (annual meeting) – \$750
Support for MINERVA – \$1,500
Publicity – \$3,000

Discussion followed on record keeping. People will need to keep track of their matches as well as their expenditures. Terms of the grant require that SCSU request payments from LSTA after expenses are incurred. Marian will work on developing the contracts. We will need a sign-in form for meetings.

Discuss tasks

1. Project manager:

Kristi T. and others said they would like to get someone onboard as soon as possible. Wendy L. asked if we had someone in mind. Mike K. asked if we have someone on staff. The grant is written so that we will contract for this position. Daardi S. mentioned a fixed-term digital librarian who might be qualified/interested.

Mike K. brought up the need for a job description. Discussion of qualifications and how to approach people we know followed. Bill D. suggested Eileen Quam (who attended the August 2001 planning conference in Monticello, Minn.) MHS has worked with her, too. Scott Sayers was also mentioned. Mike K. suggested a small group of people write a position description. Wendy suggested we talk to Eileen privately. Kristi said she is willing to call her.

The group discussed where this person would be located. That would depend in part on who we hire. Michael F. suggested that he could make arrangements at the Minnesota History Center. Eric C. said the U of M could also provide space. Others raised issues concerning the definition of a contractual position and how much support an organization could provide to a person not hired as an employee. Michael F. said he could work with a contractual position.

Keith E. and Michael F. volunteered to work on the position description. They will draft a description for committee members to discuss.

With agreement that Eileen Quam is the committee's first choice, Kristi volunteered to contact Eileen.

John B. raised concerns over the salary.

Kristi raised the question of needing to bid on a contract this big.

Michael F. said that if it needs to be bid, then this is an RFP. He will talk with his contracting office. Marian will check at SCSU.

(Note: Yes, SCSU will need to bid this out. MRR 12/16/03)

2. Collection development – establish process to identify collections

Mike K. asked what projects people have already sent to us.

Keith pointed out that the annual meeting and survey results identified some collections.

Kristi asked if we wanted to do a formal call for projects or to identify people to work with. Jason R. suggested we do both. Michael F. suggested that the MHS director of field services could develop a list.

The committee supported the idea of a general call for projects. Wendy recommend that the call include the requirements for the project. The group listed those:

- Collection criteria – before 1908, continuous tone, about Minnesota
- They provide the metadata (object)
- They send materials off sight for scanning
- Existing collections are also invited (with metadata)

We need to put word out to general listservs. Send word to attendees at workshops, annual meeting, MINERVA, etc.

Minnesota's network of multitype libraries could help us get word out. Kristi meets with them on December 16, 2003.

Kristi raised the possibility of working with individuals who own collections that fit the criteria. Keith pointed out that stories in the press will reach individuals who might be interested.

Mike K. raised the issue of rights management and the need to develop a policy and procedure for when someone "gives" something. Eric said that the MDL is seeking non-exclusive rights forever. Wendy clarified that people need to have the right to give us the digital version of these objects.

Kristi summarized the issue: for this project we're looking for people to allow us to take their things and do the scanning for them. Eric added that we can accept already scanned objects or that we can provide the equipment and they do the work as in-kind contributions to the project.

Our options are:

1. MDLC does the scanning
2. MDLC loans the equipment
3. You let MDLC have your already digitized stuff that meets the criteria/standards

Mike K. asked if we want to maintain an archival copy? Eric explained that we want to send digital masters back to them We don't want to be responsible for their masters, but we want a right to keep a copy ... and we're allowed to distribute that image.

Mike K. will draft a rights statement and distribute it through e-mail.

Daardi will write up a description of the collection requirements.

Marian will gather a list of places/groups to whom we want to send this invitation.

3) Regional Centers

Mike K. reported that St. John's University is setting up a high-end center.

Kristi asked if we should be looking at centers after we get collections to digitize.

Wendy asked if we could use MINITEX for deliveries. Bill said he would use FedEx or personal deliveries. Others concurred.

Mike K. suggested we see what collections we identify and where those collections are located. If the images are large, SJU may be able to do some of the digitization.

Other concerns: We do have equipment from the FY2002 grant and need to decide where we're going to place that. Regional centers should address the needs we identify. We need the expertise where the collection need is.

Keith reminded people that the MDLC now has

- a laptop and a good flatbed scanner
 - a workstation and a scanner
 - a workstation for the director
- Both available for "centers"

Other points raised: We could "loan" some of the MDLC equipment to places that have the expertise to do the work and create the metadata but who could benefit from more equipment. We could also take the equipment to a site if the collection warranted that option, and MDLC personnel could still do the digitization.

The committee agreed with Mike K.'s summary that most of the digitizing is likely to be completed at the U of M and the Minnesota History Center, but we do have the resources to digitize elsewhere.

IMAGES

John B informed that group that converting IMAGES to MySQL is no longer an expectation for this project. U of M is locking in on a long-term contract with Oracle for multi-sight licenses and to resolve the issues of simultaneous users. He is 99 percent sure they will be continuing with Oracle. He distributed copies of the IMAGES timeline that he had prepared for the grant application.

Mike K. reminded the committee that we always looked at IMAGES as a short-term option.

Michael F. also reminded people of the questions of scalability and extensibility with IMAGES.

The MDLC will continue to work with IMAGES for the signature project but look at other options for the future.

Participants

Keith and others raised issues of how we can draw more participants into the Minnesota Digital Library, not to the Steering Committee.

LSTA FY2004 Funding

A. MDLC role in reviewing grant applications

B. Another MDLC application

Marian suggested possibility of MDLC seeking more funds for digitization projects and buying more time for the director.

Mike K. suggested that the MDLC could review the feasibility of projects submitted for LSTA funding.

Daardi suggested that the collection form we develop for Minnesota Reflections could be useful to LSTA in writing project expectations.

Mike K. suggested that MDLC could do the technical review.

Michael F. suggested that MDLC consider limiting projects institutionally, and geographically/regionally to increase distribution.

Kristi suggested LSTA could look for projects that could enhance the impact of Minnesota Reflections and the impact of this sesquicentennial project.

Keith pointed out that the quality of images and the quality of the metadata should also be issues.

Mike K. raised concerns with MDLC putting in a grant of its own and also reviewing the grants of other organizations. This is a conflict of interest.

Kristi recommended inviting Jym Wroblewski (LSTA coordinator) to an MDLC meeting after he has been informed by IMLS of the state's LSTA allocation for FY 2004.

Other funding opportunities

The Committee discussed a variety of opportunities for funding, such as National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC).

Other issues:

Jason recommend that we develop training in metadata after the U has created the tools for IMAGES for metadata input. Training then would be on specific needs rather than general standards.

Daardi asked how long the Minnesota Reflections projects would take. Marian said the vision of the grant was several months and others concurred. Daardi asked if that meant they would be small projects. Keith said that most likely they would be small, perhaps 500 images that we digitize, but that, too, would come out in the applications from organizations.

Next MDLC Steering Committee:

10 a.m., Friday, January 23, 2004. MINITEX offices

Notes by Marian Rengel (12/03/03)

-