

**Minnesota Digital Library  
Meeting Notes**

**December 11, 2006**

**MINITEX Conference Room, Anderson Library, University of Minnesota**

Present: Bill DeJohn (MINITEX), Gay Galles (MEMO), Marian Rengel (MDLC/SCSU), Mary Parker (MINITEX), Steve Harsin (IRRC), Todd Digby (MnSCU), Larry Hardesty (WSU), Kendall Larson (WSU), Irene Van Bavel (MHS), Carla Dewey Urban (MINITEX), Ben Leonard (NCHS), Jason Roy (UofM), John Butler (UofM), John Larson (St. Paul Public), Suzanne Miller (State Library), Emily Kissane (Minnesota Office of Higher Education), Kristi Tornquist (SCSU), Eric Celeste (UofM), Kathy Parker (CSB/SJU), Keith Ewing (SCSU), Daardi Sizemore (MSU, MANKATO) – recorder

1. Introduction of New Members
  - a. We have had two new people join us. Larry Hardesty from Winona State University and John Larson from St. Paul Public Library
2. Outreach Coordinator's Report
  - a. Marian asked for assistance taking notes for the meeting. Daardi agreed to do this.
  - b. Marian has been working on building contacts in the library community to develop awareness about the MDL. This is particularly important as we consider assessment and new contributors.
  - c. Marian is continuing to make connections with possible contributors. Following up with phone calls has been very important. She is hearing that they want us to keep digitizing. This is valuable to them. Some folks are still concerned about sending their materials away for digitization. They are noticing how much time it takes to get the images ready for digitization.
  - d. How do we sell participation in the MDL? Marian mentioned that those she calls who have heard of us are generally interested. Those she hits cold are usually a bit hesitant. It was mentioned that if we highlight our statistics that might be a selling point for organizations. Different organizations in the MDLC have used their digital images in creative ways.
    - i. A suggestion was made to create a website for participants on uses of images in Reflections -- a sort of clearinghouse to help people utilize their images.
    - ii. Another suggestion was that we might encourage organizations to start with small projects to help them get up to speed on the time and effort involved in participation.
    - iii. Possibly develop a FAQ handout for participants/potential participants about what we (MDLC) do, what they do, selecting images and anything else. Share real time estimates for selection and metadata.

- e. There was a discussion about if the MDLC should consider giving money to organizations to help with selection and metadata. There was some concern about this. It is something to possibly consider for the future, particularly for a special grant.
- f. Marian has been talking with folks in the City of St. Cloud about ways they may be able to participate. She is being careful to not sell us as a records management repository. We may want to consider what we might want/not want from cities. Possibly focused around topics/time periods/event.

### 3. Developing Scanning Centers

- a. SELCO is intrigued by the idea of hosting a scanning center in southeastern Minnesota. They have some equipment and space. Marian has had preliminary discussions with them about the idea but it is only at an idea stage. There was much discussion about the topic.
  - i. Marian and Jason drafted something for the group to look at relating to “Possible Scanning Center Issues to be Discussed.”
  - ii. If we did a scanning center it would have to be in the next grant.
  - iii. A third scanning center should only be opened if demand requires it. The MDL should not be the sole reason a scanning site exists. It shouldn’t be because groups don’t want to send materials to the Twin Cities. SELCO sees a demand but we would need real numbers to make any decisions.
  - iv. If an additional scanning center was set up, the MDL would need to manage the site (train, check on, upgrade equipment, etc.) This would require more MDL management time.
  - v. Bob Horton sent an e-mail reminding us this may not be a direction the MDLC would like to go.
  - vi. There was discussion about outsourcing in the region as a possibility. This brought up questions about people who scan their own images, should they get paid too if we allowed outsourcing. It goes back to the idea of re-granting. There is still much debate over this.
  - vii. There was a question about the ILL courier service as a means of transporting materials (collections, scanners, etc.) around the state. This was not recommended.
  - viii. Would scanning centers have a representative on the Steering Committee?
- b. Discussion wrap up
  - i. We are very reluctant to set up a scanning center at this time.
  - ii. MDLC sets the agenda and standards for scanning in Minnesota.
  - iii. We should look at the digitization capacity around the state in preparation of the next grant.
  - iv. Suzanne asked “What’s in it for us?” Instead of regional scanning centers she would rather have regions be metadata support or perhaps metadata quality control.

- v. We could require metadata training for all participants.
- vi. We might want to incorporate the idea of “What do they expect from us?” in the forthcoming assessment.

#### 4. Grant Projects

- a. The LSTA letter of intent is due January 5. The final application is due March 5. We are applying to continue our current grant and expand assessment. We will set aside money to work on concerns that come from the assessment which will be done in January.
- b. IMLS – We are considering applying for a National Leadership grant which is due March 1. A match is required and includes in-kind donations. LSTA funding does not count for the match. This grant could include components integrating Pachyderm. The visioning group will discuss this grant.
- c. Teach American History – Several school districts in the state are applying for this grant. We should provide them all with some language about the MDL for them to include in their grant applications.
- d. Legislative Funding – MINITEX and MOHE budgets are in. Emily is answering a lot of questions. We are waiting on the announcement of the Governor’s budget in January.

#### 5. Pachyderm Funding

- a. We have a draft proposal for MnSCU funding for additional learning objects utilizing Pachyderm.
- b. There is a new learning object repository committee which may also have money for developing learning objects. This committee has representatives from K-12 and the university communities. If they provide funding it may also be available for hosting Pachyderm. Todd is going to follow up with the committee.

#### 6. Annual Meeting

- a. Daardi handed out a draft of ideas about the annual meeting. It included an educators track (where they would leave with learning objects created), a technical track (more advanced topics), and a Minnesota Stories track (what’s going on in Minnesota.)
- b. The group liked the ideas in general and had suggestions on possible keynote speakers/topics. It was agreed that a keynote speaker would be good to have.
- c. We considered time of year and location. We are currently looking at having the meeting at St. Cloud State University in late May, early June in an effort to get school teachers.
- d. We are also looking at charging a registration fee of about \$20. We will work on the idea of some scholarships.
- e. If you have ideas for speakers (sessions or keynote) please get them to Daardi ASAP.

- f. An announcement will need to go out in January about the date; the program will need to be finalized by the end of February.
7. Subcommittee Reports – We broke up into subcommittees. These are the brief reports made back to the group.
- a. Strategic Planning – They would like to add a line to their charge. They would like to include environmental scanning and funding. They will address our visioning statement and branding.
  - b. Management Team – They have been meeting for several years. They have some minor wording changes. One of them is to change the first word of their charge to Manage/Implement
    - i. They have concerns of overlap among the groups, but as long as we communicate and ask input of other groups this should be successful.
    - ii. They also had questions about the role of the outreach coordinator.
  - c. Assessment – This group is going to work on the assessment that will be coming out in January. Any group with topics they want addressed should get that information to the group. The committee will send drafts to the listserv before sending the survey.
  - d. Other – Groups should meet as needed. We still need a charge for the steering committee.
8. Next Meetings
- a. January 26, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. at MINITEX
  - b. March 1, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. at MINITEX