

2001 FINAL REPORT AND EXPENDITURES FOR
LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT (LSTA) GRANT – 2001
INSTRUCTIONS

DUE DATE: Please check your LSTA Project Grant Contract to verify the time period for your grant. On the first page of the contract under Section IV. Agreement Period, is listed the actual dates for your project. Your Final Report is due 90 days from the end date listed in Section IV. Agreement Period.
Call Jym Wroblewski/LSTA Coordinator, Library Development and Services at 651-582-8722 if you have questions.

NOTE: A separate copy of this report should be completed for each LSTA project you received funding.

1. Name and address of grant recipient: (Same as on the original grant application)

The Minnesota Academic Group for New Opportunities in Library and Information Access (MAGNOLIA). Members include the library directors from:
St. Cloud State University, 420 Fourth Ave., S., St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498 (Kristi Tornquist)
Minnesota State University, Mankato, 228 Wiecking Center, Mankato, MN 56002-8419 (Joan Roca)
Winona State University, POBox 5838, Winon, MN (Christine Clement)
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, University Libraries, 309 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55455 (Peggy Johnson)
MINITEX, 15 Andersen Library, 222 21st Ave., S., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0439 (Bill DeJohn)

2. Name, title, phone, fax, and e-mail address of administrator (Same as on the original grant application unless position changed during the grant year.)

Kristi Tornquist, Dean
Learning Resources and Technology Services
St. Cloud State University
(320) 255-2022

3. Name of Project: (Name listed on original application.)

Minnesota Digital Library (MDL) Preliminary Planning Project

4. a. Federal Project purpose number: Federal Project purpose number can be found on the LDS website <http://cfl.state.mn.us/library/lsta.html>. The Plan is summarized in an outline form: [Federal Purposes, Minnesota Goals, Project Activities, 1998-2003](#).

b. LSTA Plan Goal Number – State Goal number cited on original grant application

Goal number: 2 Activity letter: C

c. LSTA Plan Activity Number - State Activity Number cited on original grant application.

d. Federal Congressional District(s) – Please list the congressional district or districts your project impacted.

5. Narrative Report for project

A. In full detail describe what happened with your project. Include what you did, when elements of the project were done, how were they done and by whom.

Minnesota Digital Library Planning Meeting

Twenty-five librarians, archivists, museum specialists, technologists, and policy developers, identified and selected by MAGNOLIA to represent a broad spectrum of public and private cultural heritage institutions in Minnesota, attended a three day planning conference on 14-16 August 2001 in Monticello, Minnesota. During the conference attendees discussed the meaning and intent of a collaborative digital library project for Minnesota, began identifying political issues for collaboration and public-private joint initiatives, and established four working groups and a coordinating executive committee. The conference attendees to were able to achieve considerable consensus on a definition for a digital library and a mission statement that envisioned collaboration as a necessary foundation for coordinated development of and access to a digitization project of broad scope, theme, technical requirements, and dispersed collections. While participants noted that the value of the project for users was dependent on suitable metadata and digitization standards, the long term viability of the project would be determined by establishing a participation and governance structure that recognized the benefits of collaboration and collective actions while acknowledging the imperatives of autonomy.

The working groups were organized around four major themes:

- participation, policy and planning (to identify and resolve issues related to participation, governance, finance, and long term viability of the project);
- standards and training (to identify and establish descriptive, technical, and administrative metadata standards, identify best practices for production and presentation, and create workshops to train participants in best practices and procedures for digital library projects);
- collections (to identify and draft collection goals and policies, to establish a means of analyzing collections and repositories in Minnesota for potential digitization and electronic distribution); and
- audiences (to develop an appropriate means of identifying and assessing potential users and their interests on a continuing basis as a guide to digitization projects, interface design, and application development).

Two of these work groups continued to meet after the original conference. The standards and training group develop draft standards that were published on the Minnesota Digital Library Project Website. The collections group has developed a draft outline for a collection policy that has been distributed for comment. The executive committee has met several times to refine project goals and planning as further grant applications have been developed.

The project established a baseline of information and collaborative ideals upon which to build a Minnesota Digital Library. The essentials of this foundation are embodied in the final report of the planning conference, in presentations made at the planning conference, and in draft documents for metadata standards and production best practices; these documents are available through the temporary MDL Website at <http://lrs.stcloudstate.edu/mdl/index.html>. The final report was disseminated to conference participants at the beginning of October 2001 and published on the MDL Website and announced on various statewide listservs by mid-October.

Other events as a result of the planning conference.

In addition to the MDL Website, an MDL listserv (mdl@stcloudstate.edu) hosted by St. Cloud State University was established. An announcement for the listserv, along with subscription information, was sent to various statewide listservs serving libraries, archives, museums, and educators.

Subsequent to the conference, Keith Ewing, St. Cloud State University and coordinator for the planning conference, has made presentations about the MDL project at the MINERVA (Minnesota Electronic Resources in the Visual Arts) conference in October 2001 and the MnSCU Academic Library conference in April 2002; another presentation is planned for the Minnesota Library Association conference in October 2002. Mr. Ewing also participated in an interview for an article in the St. Cloud Times newspaper and an interview broadcast on an Alexandria television station. Mr. Ewing has also attended several meetings of the Minnesota Humanities Commission's Minnesota Online Encyclopedia project to explore opportunities for partnership. Chuck Thomas, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, on behalf of the MDL project has been attending as a metadata specialist inter-state coordinating meetings sponsored by the Colorado Digitization Project.

Funds remaining after fulfilling the primary grant objectives were used to support sending Keith Ewing, MDL project coordinator, to the WebWise 2002 Conference sponsored by the Institute of Museum and Library Services and Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland.

- B. List each objective given in the original grant application and describe the end results or outcomes that were achieved. Were any changes made to the project objectives and outcomes during the project year? If so, why

Objectives

- Conference goals were established by MAGNOLIA and conference planners. These included defining a Minnesota Digital Library project, delineating general project issues, concerns, and goals, and establishing a foundation for collaboration and cooperation.
- Twenty-five people met on 14-16 August 2001 in Monticello, Minnesota, and worked to meet goals set by conference planners. Conference participants established a mission statement, general project goals, clear decisions necessary to create a foundation, and working groups to expand upon project goals and create working documents and guidelines. During the conference, working groups identified technical issues, funding challenges, and collaboration opportunities.
- A final report was written distributed to conference participants, published on a Website and announced on several statewide listservs. The presentation by conference consultant Nancy Allen and the project presentation by Keith Ewing were published on the Website as supporting documents.

- C. Number of People Served: Please list the actual number of people or end users served by the project. Be specific. There may be several thousand people in your region or several hundred or thousand people served by the local community public, school, special or academic library but of those how many were directly impacted by the project.

(Example -Delivery Service – West Minnesota Regional Library has a population base of 132,200. West Minnesota Regional Library was awarded an LSTA Delivery Project to enhance and expand delivery services to libraries within its region. The project improved delivery services and enabled 1,322 end users to have quicker access to materials they needed. Not every resident in West Minnesota Regional Library was affected by delivery service or received any direct benefit. Through outcome measures region found approximately 10% of the residents did receive direct benefit from the

delivery service.)

Number of People Served:

The MDL project intends to serve all people who are interested in accessing information about the cultural heritage of Minnesota. This potential audience is larger than the population of Minnesota (almost 5 million), but realistically may be about 10% of that group in any given year. Without an actual end user product or service, the current audience for the project remains relatively small. The conference report, however, has been downloaded more than 150 times from the MDL Web site since 1 October 2001.

6. Give details regarding continuation of the project. State plans for continuation or reasons for not moving forward and continuing the project. Was the project meant to continue? If you choose to continue project how will it be funded?

Project continuation:

The MDL project, through MAGNOLIA, received a second LSTA grant to support continued planning and to conduct a series of workshops. Both the standards and training and collections working groups have met to continue development of policy statements. The standards and training group is in the process of revising metadata standards and production best practices. These will form the foundation of a workshop to be offered later this year, most likely in Rochester in partnership with the Olmstead Historical Society; the group is investigating providing two additional workshops in other locations. The collections group is developing methodologies to identify collections and objects suitable for digitization. The audience group has yet to meet, but has been discussing through email an instrument to survey user interests, needs, and expectations to guide digitization emphasis and application development. The policy and planning group, consisting largely of directors, managers, and deans, is planning to meet in the near future to begin tackling difficult collaboration and finance issues.

Keith Ewing and Marian Rengel have submitted an IMLS grant application that would support significant database and application development, including OAI harvester and search applications. They have also submitted an LSTA grant application that would support a photo digitization project drawing from the collections of St. Cloud State University, the Central Minnesota Historical Center, and the Stearns History Museum. The team is looking for other grant opportunities and is developing project partnerships. Kristi Tornquist, St. Cloud State University, presented an outline of the MDL project at the MLA Legislative Forum for consideration as part of the MLA legislative agenda for the 2003 session.

7. Expenditures – Reviewing the Project Expenditures on page four of your grant application detail where the funds were spent. Explain any changes or variances from the original project expenditures. Fully explain any expenditure line that is over or under 10% from the original expenditure line.
8. Now that the project has been completed please explain anything you would have done differently. What would have made this a better project?

The planning conference went fairly well. Nancy Allen from the Colorado Digitization Project proved to be a knowledgeable, personable, and effective consultant and presenter. The discussions among the participants as a whole could have been more effective had a facilitator been present or if the conference planners had training in facilitation techniques. The mix of participants from cultural heritage institutions (libraries, archives, museums, and historical societies) was appropriate, but the inclusion of representatives from K-12 and higher education would have been beneficial. Senator Steve Kelley provided valuable remarks on the final day of the conference, but his time and participation were limited. These were minor problems that did not greatly affect the conference final report, but did affect the efficiency of the conference.

Conference planners did not identify or create adequate opportunities to sustain and channel the enthusiasm generated during the conference. Too much depended upon the largesse of home institutions and the volunteerism of participants. Working groups with clearly delineated goals, such as standards, were able to accomplish a great deal after the conference, largely due to the efforts of a few individuals. Other working groups, with less defined goals, have not been as successful despite the efforts of work group coordinators. A great deal is dependent upon the policy and planning group to resolve difficult participation, collaboration, funding, and ownership issues.

While grant applications to sustain and expand the project continue to be submitted, the absence of an actual collaborative digitization project under the rubric of the Minnesota Digital Library project means an absence of commitment from potential participants. Planning is valuable and necessary, but a viable product drives interest and generates support. Recent grant applications have sought to sustain the development process while creating model collaborative digitization projects. We should have better anticipated this problem.

9. Attachments: Please include any materials you think are relevant to this project evaluation, such as survey questions, comparative statistics, news clippings, testimonial letters, reports, and reactions from participants or residents of the community. Please attach any bibliographies, brochures, handbooks, catalogs, etc. produced by the project.
10. Signatures: Please have both the Governing Board President and the Administrator sign the Final Report.