

**2002 FINAL REPORT AND EXPENDITURES FOR
LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT (LSTA) GRANT – FY2002-Round I**

Submit one signed and dated original and 1 copy to:

Jym Wroblewski/LSTA Coordinator – O 4
Library Development and Services
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville MN 55113-4266
PH: 651-582-8805; FAX: 651-582-8731

Due to LDS September 30, 2003, 4:00 p.m.

Minnesota LSTA FY2002-I Final Report Follow the exact form, contents, and pagination provided by LDS.
A separate report should be completed for each LSTA project for which you received funding. Complete the final report within 30 days from the end date of the agreement period listed on your grant contract.

1. Name and address of grant recipient:

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, P.O. Box 5838, Winona, MN (Christine Clements)

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, University Libraries, 309-19th Ave. S, Minneapolis, MN, 55455 (Thomas Shaughnessy).

Also a member MINITEX, Library Information Network, UofM, 15 Andersen Library, 222-21st Ave. S, Mpls. MN, 55455 (Bill DeJohn).

2. Name, title, phone, fax, and e-mail address of administrator:

Kristi Tornquist, Dean

Learning Resources and Technology Services

St. Cloud State University

(320) 255-2022

kmtornquist@stcloudstate.edu

3. Name of Project: Minnesota Digital Library Planning Project – Stage II

4. Grant was obtained under: *State of Minnesota Five Year State Plan for the Use of Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Funds - Fiscal Years 1998 - 2003 and the LSTA Priorities for FY 2002.*

- a. Federal Project purpose number: _____
- b. LSTA Plan Goal number: 2
- c. LSTA Plan Activity letter: C
- d. Federal Congressional District(s) all

5. Narrative report for project.

A. Describe the project completely (what was done, when, how and by whom).

The original grant application put forward several ambitious goals centered on the meetings and activities of working groups established at the August 2001 Minnesota Digital Library planning summit. At the planning summit, each discussion group articulated several planning objectives that would provide a stronger commitment to collaboration and a clear set of goals and objectives that would guide project development. The grant application, however, did not adequately consider the necessity to redefine the goals and objectives of the MDL project and how that would change the organizational structure, the task, and desired outcomes identified. What we did not sufficiently understand in writing the grant application was that the process we were describing was one of community building, defining the social structures and relationships, and creating a knowledgeable community. Unlike project engineering, social construction is slow, moving forward, sideways, and occasionally backwards as the community grows and defines its purpose and nature. We attempted to fit this social construction into the original goals.

Activities related to Goal 1: Identify Partners and create governance structure

Tasks: 1) Explore policy and governance options

2) Conduct cost analysis

Outcome: A Plan for making the Minnesota Digital Library a separate, viable entity complete with business plan, partners and decision making procedures.

The Policy and Planning Work Group, under the leadership of Kristi Tornquist (SCSU), began meeting in August 2002 and initiated stimulating and rewarding discussions. Tom Shaughnessy (UofM), who retired, was replaced by Wendy Pradt Lougee (U of M). Her deep and lengthy background and experience with digital projects at the University of Michigan has helped direct and focus discussions within the work group. In addition, Michael Fox (MHS) joined the group to participate in discussions and bring his considerable experience along with institutional commitment to the project. Other members of this important work group have included Joan Roca (MSU), Bill DeJohn (MINITEX), Michael Kathman (CSB/SJU), Christine Clements (WSU), Eileen McCormack (MN Dept of Admin), and Keith Ewing (SCSU).

The Work Group discussed and reconsidered every aspect of a statewide digital initiative for Minnesota, from what resources are necessary and their implications for organizational structure, to how data is structured for alternative methods of information retrieval, to identifying transitional, potential, and permanent partners and their contributions to the project, to selecting a name that better embraces the mission of the project. At meetings in August and September 2002, the group discussed various models of participation and governance, identifying a federated structure as a possible future. They discussed the meaning of participation and changed from the idea of membership to that of partnership. The work group strongly agreed that MDL partners would be limited to institutions that would agree to contribute content, to assist in application development, to share expertise, to commit to practices that assure interoperability, and to invest significant resources, including time, people, and knowledge, to build a model of collaboration.

The group also proposed an MDLC Steering Committee that would evolve from the Policy and Planning Work Group to guide transitional development of the project. The Steering Committee would determine where we can or should collaborate, set project direction, establish sub-committees (work groups) and expectations, identify resource needs, focus grant activities, and document and communicate the project. In order to strengthen the overall discussions of the group, the initial Executive Committee, consisting of the chairpersons of the working groups, was folded into the Steering Committee. This change added John Butler (U of M), Daardi Sizemore (MSU), and Jason Roy (MHS); later, Marian Rengel (SCSU), grant writer, was added. This expanded committee has met monthly for four to six hours since August 2002 and continues on this schedule since the grant period ended in August 2003. Kathleen Flynn, St. Paul Public Library, joined the Steering Committee in the summer of 2002.

In September 2002 the Steering Committee proposed a reorganization of work groups into sub-committees of the steering committee to better undertake planning and establish a stronger infrastructure for development and collaboration. The new sub-committees would replace the interim work groups set up during the August 2001 summit. These sub-committees would initially include:

1. **Applications and Audiences** (charge would include: identify strategies to encourage and engage utilization and development of programs that apply Minnesota Digital Library resources in numerous contexts; define the functionalities needed; and identify audiences and contexts for and in which the Minnesota Digital Library content might be used)
2. **Technical Issues** (charge would include: explore the structures and systems for storage, discovery, and delivery of distributed collections; and consider the pros and cons of multiple models including centralized database, distributed architecture and hybrids)
3. **Capture and Creation** (charge would include: Explore methods and resources for the standards-based creation and capture of digital projects; delineate guidelines for types of objects; consider source medium; and examine compression techniques)

The Technical Issues subcommittee met three times via conference calls to discuss the technical foundation for future projects. One major issue in these discussions was a digital resource management system that would be scalable for size and scale of the initial digitization effort. Among the products discussed were:

- Greenstone, an OpenSource database and digital asset management system available from the New Zealand Digital Library Project (see: <http://www.greenstone.org>). Greenstone is widely used in small and large digitization projects. The OpenSource nature of Greenstone is both desirable and problematic; OpenSource flexibility allows for relatively easy modification to meet local needs but also requires a technician sufficiently familiar with the logic and operating structure to modify and manage. No one in Minnesota currently uses Greenstone.
- ContentDM, a fee-based database available through the OCLC Digital Co-op. ContentDM is another widely used database and digital image management system. While an excellent choice, the cost per image escalates with the size of the database. No one in Minnesota currently uses ContentDM.
- Luna Imaging, a fee-based digital library system. Widely used and a strong competitor with ContentDM in the commercial market, Luna would be a good option for MDLC because of its powerful asset management functions; substantial initial cost precluded its consideration for a project of this scale.
- DLXS, a fee-based digital image management system developed by the University of Michigan. This powerful database would be a viable option for the MDLC, although there is some concern about future scalability and the ability to create substantive crosswalks with existing databases, but the cost exceeded the budget for this project. The University of Michigan has recently made this database available for purchase.
- IMAGES, a digital image management system based on Oracle developed at the University of Minnesota. During discussions of database options within the MDLC, the University of Minnesota offered IMAGES as a platform for initial MDLC initiatives. After investigating the continuing costs of Oracle licenses to support a widely distributed collaborative environment, the MDLC decided to seek support to recreate IMAGES as an OpenSource environment; U of M staff will be undertaking this effort during 2004.
- Another option, Fedora, was not available during our initial review. Fedora, a free OpenSource digital image management system jointly developed by the University of Virginia and Cornell University, may contain some functional components that could be adapted within IMAGES.

In October 2002, the Steering Committee proposed a new name that would better portray the mission and goals for the project. Initially, the Coalition for Minnesota Digital Collections was adopted; this was revised in March 2003 to the Minnesota Digital Library Coalition.

In order to promote understanding of the complexity of digitization and preservation projects and to build a knowledgeable community of potential MDLC participants, MDLC in partnership with MINITEX sponsored two related workshops, “Developing and Managing Digital Projects” and “Grant Writing for Digitization and Preservation Projects,” in December 2002 at the Elmer L. Andersen Library at U of M in Minneapolis. Gayle

Palmer, Manager of Digital and Preservation Services at OCLC's Western Service Center in Lacey, WA, conducted both workshops; 42 people attended the "Managing" workshop and 36 people attended the "Grant Writing" workshop. Evaluations of both were very positive; all responses indicated the "Managing" workshop was "excellent" or "good;" a majority of responses indicated the "Grant Writing" workshop was "excellent" or "good." Respondents generally indicated both workshops were "helpful," "valuable," "learned a lot," "very useful," and "excellent." Most of the attendees indicated an interest in participating in future MDLC initiatives. A third community building and knowledge expansion workshop, "Introduction to Metadata," was presented by Jason Roy, MHS, and Eric Celeste, U OF M, (both members of the MDLC Steering Committee) and hosted by the Olmstead Country Historical Society in Rochester, MN, on 21 August 2003; twenty people attended this workshop and the response was very positive; Sherry Sweetman, Archivist for the Olmsted County Historical Society, reported that "the workshop was very informative." Each workshop contributed to the knowledge and interest of a growing community of cultural heritage institutions interested in working with the MDLC or participating in MDLC initiatives. Additionally, members of the MDLC sponsored with time and talent the 2002 and 2003 Minnesota Electronic Resources in the Visual Arts (MINERVA) annual conferences.

The Applications and Audiences working group (a combination of the earlier Collections and Audiences working groups) developed a survey instrument to identify the varieties of collections and the levels of interest in digitization. The survey attempted to determine the nature and scope of collections and interest in both digitizing resources for Web access and participating in MDLC projects. The survey was mailed to every country historical society, museum, archives, and public and academic library in Minnesota as well as distributed via e-mail to several statewide listservs. Survey responses (90+ completed questionnaires) were reviewed by John Butler, Daardi Sizemore, Marian Rengel, and Keith Ewing; statistical analysis was provided by SCSU. The survey revealed that many libraries and historical societies across the state have in their collections items that could be digitized for inclusion in a signature project. The survey also showed that many of these organizations, from the largest to the smallest, have a strong interest in developing their skills in digitization and in using developed standards for metadata collection, image scanning, and quality control.

In February 2003 the Steering Committee contracted with John Price Wilkin, Director of the University of Michigan Digital Library Production Service (DLPS), to consult with MDLC on project vision, goals, and directions. A full-day of presentations and discussion was held on 21 February at the University of Minnesota. Wilkin confirmed much of the MDLC vision and offered sound advice on goals and directions, focusing on the need to adopt a robust and scalable database environment in which to begin development. The DXLS environment developed at the DLPS was discussed in considerable detail. Wilkin also discussed with the Steering Committee the social and political complexities of large research institutions working with small and diverse cultural heritage institutions on coordinated and collaborative digitization projects.

By the end of March 2003 the Steering Committee adopted the *Western States Digital Imaging Best Practices* (available online at http://www.cdpheritage.org/resource/scanning/documents/WSDIBP_v1_2003-01-13.pdf) and the *Western States Dublin Core Metadata Best Practices* (available online at http://www.cdpheritage.org/resource/metadata/documents/WSDCMBP_v1-2_2003-01-20.pdf). Both of these standards were subsequently reviewed and accepted by the MINITEX/LDS Standards Task Force as statewide standards. The Committee agreed that Dublin Core provided a foundation schema that should not inhibit expansion for individual collections, projects, or institutions. The schema inherent in IMAGES already accommodates most of the Dublin Core elements; minor modification will incorporate remaining elements.

In May 2003 the University of Minnesota offered and the MDLC accepted the use of IMAGES, a digital asset management system developed by the University, as a foundation upon which to initiate the signature project. Discussions centered on continuing development in the current Oracle environment or recreating the system in OpenSource using MySQL. Based on experience of U of M developers with MySQL and the potential cost of Oracle licenses for MDLC participants, the committee decided on moving IMAGES to OpenSource and submitted an LSTA grant to fund that endeavor. By late summer 2003, the U of M staff was working with a digitization project undertaken by the Stearns History Museum and St. Cloud State University to load images and metadata into IMAGES; completion of this effort, which required some modification of image identifiers, is expected by late December 2003.

During this period, the MDLC completed definition of its proposed signature project, *Minnesota Reflections*. The proposal is an ambitious plan to digitize and make accessible primary image resources relating to Minnesota created up to 1908, including territorial settlement and the first 50 years of Minnesota statehood. Minnesota's sesquicentennial will occur in 2008 and this project would provide the state and its citizens with images that explore those first formative years of statehood. The time frame allows us to work with images that are no longer governed by copyright restrictions and makes bringing them into the MDLC collections less complicated. Concentrating on continuous-tone images – i.e. visual resources such as photographs and slides – will allow us to focus on the development of content management and associated access software. Focusing in this way – on the first 50 years of statehood and on continuous tone images – allows us to work with libraries and historical societies across the state and of varying sizes. The signature project would emphasize the period up to 1908; images from subsequent periods will be included but not part of the initial digitization emphasis.

On 2 June 2003 the MDLC held its second planning conference at the Minnesota History Center in St. Paul; more than 100 people registered for the presentations and discussion. Tom Clareson, Manager of the Digital and Preservation Outreach Services at OCLC, provided a keynote address on the varieties of governance structures seen in large-scale collaborative and statewide digitization projects. Presentations on current digitization projects in Minnesota included the Minnesota Historical Society's Duluth Lynchings Online Resource (<http://collections.mnhs.org/duluthlynchings/>) and the University of Minnesota's IMAGES database (<http://digital.lib.umn.edu>). Kristi Tornquist (SCSU) provided an overview of MDLC developments to date. John Butler (U of M) and Daardi Sizemore (MSU) presented the results of the statewide collections and digitization interests survey conducted by the MDLC and described the signature project, *Minnesota Reflections*, proposed by the MDLC. Members of the MDLC Steering Committee then served as a panel and responded to questions and suggestions for the signature project from attendees.

Responses to the signature project ranged from agreement with the proposal to emphasize continuous tone images (photographs and similar graphic objects), to suggestions to include books, other media, and oral histories; additional comments included ideas for focused themes, global themes, and open-ended themes as well as whether to focus on objects about Minnesota or objects in Minnesota. Concern was expressed about sensitivity to Native American issues and other ethnic groups. In general, the reaction was positive; if there was any quantifiable support for a signature project, it was to confirm the emphasis on continuous tone images.

Participants at the June conference provided positive feedback. For 51 total responses, based on a 1-5 scale (with 5 being excellent), participants ranked the following:

Conference value: 4.08

Information about the conference: 4.31

Conference speaker/presentations: 4.37

Interest in participating in MDL signature project: 2.49 (however, there was wide interest in working with the MDLC in some capacity)

47% of respondents already provide access to digital collections.

Finally, through drafting the LSTA 2003 grant application, the MDLC finalized the definition for the *Minnesota Reflections* signature project and outlined an organizational structure to support initial development. The organizational structure proposes a director who would be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the project, including contacting potential participants, working with participants to select appropriate collections and images for inclusion in the initial phase, to supervise digitization and metadata development, to coordinate with the MDLC Steering Committee and primary development partners (e.g., U of M on redevelopment of IMAGES as an OpenSource) on completing the next phase of implementation, and assist with securing future funding support. The MDLC Steering Committee will remain the overall governing body of the MDLC for the foreseeable future; recent meetings have discussed inclusion of new participants in decision-making. The governing structure, administrative structure, and operational business plan, all of which have been discussed and are outlined in Steering Committee

minutes, need to be formalized; this will be a primary task for the Steering Committee and the new director over the next several months.

Activities related to Goal 2: Conduct Assessments

Tasks: 1) Identify/inventory collections: identify object types in existing and potential collections

2) Survey/identify users: develop survey tool, work with consultant

Outcome: Specific understanding of audience need for a centralized, statewide cooperative digital library project. Project plan in place for acquisitioning current digital collections into this library and digitizing important collections to make them available through this library

Tasks identified to fulfill Goal 2 were both ambitious and ambiguous. They involved both the planning and preparation of two disparate work groups.

The Collections Work Group, under the leadership of Daardi Sizemore (MSU), was able to meet once in Mankato and conduct business via e-mail to create a draft Collection Development Policy and a draft plan for assessing potential collections and resources for digitization. The Audience Work Group, under the leadership of John Butler (U of M), suffered a setback when Scott Sayre left the Minneapolis Institute of Arts to join AMICO: Art Museum Image Consortium as Director of Member Services. The work group with the lowest participation rapidly lost focus as the demands of their employers took precedence. These two groups were combined to create the Applications and Audiences working group; Daardi Sizemore and John Butler serve as co-chairs of the group and also serve on the Steering Committee.

The revision of project goals and directions that took place as part of Goal 1 had a substantial impact upon this goal and its associated tasks. Nonetheless, the working group created a survey instrument to assess the nature and scope of cultural heritage collections around Minnesota and potential interest in participating in a collaborative digitization effort under the leadership of the MDLC. The survey and its results are discussed under Goal 1 above. In short, many respondents have collections, primarily photographic images, which could be digitized; there is widespread fear that digitization would decrease potential revenue for small and poorly funded local museums and archives; there is interest in digitizing resources if it does not have a cost to local institutions and local ownership of digitized images is assured; and collaborating with the MDLC, if all other issues can be addressed, could yield positive results. The MDLC believes it can address the concerns of small historical societies, museums, archives, and libraries and is working to provide assurances in the signature project, *Minnesota Reflections*.

Most of our audience need assessments have to date been based on Steering Committee member assumptions which have partially confirmed by MHS and the U of M experience with their digitization projects and through discussions with interested individuals, primarily high school teachers and media specialists. Throughout the course of Steering Committee discussions, there has been wide understanding that these audiences we have targeted are among the final range of users, but that new audiences and new uses of projects create exciting and energizing opportunities. The Steering Committee has continually emphasized the educational potential of MDLC digitization efforts, especially *Minnesota Reflections*, and has developed a focus group approach to assess use, application development, and curriculum integration for the 2003-4 LSTA grant application.

Activities related to Goal 3: Establish standards

Tasks: 1) Review and adopt metadata standards, object selection standards, standard procedures

2) Adapt existing University of Minnesota crosswalk scheme and database for use by MDL

3) Review and adopt standards for digital image quality

4) One-day workshop for potential participants in MDL to raise awareness about participating in and managing digitization projects

Outcome: Have in place technical standards for using metadata, establish functioning crosswalks between collections, begin training and create awareness of the digital library project

The Standards and Training Work Group, under the leadership of Chuck Thomas (U of M), was the least affected by changes prompted by Steering Committee discussions. Members of this group met several times at the University of Minnesota to further develop draft metadata and scanning standards distributed after the August 2001 planning summit. Concurrent with this revision, Chuck Thomas (U of M), on behalf of the MDLC and the U of M,

worked with the Western States Digital Standards Group, organized under the Western Trails IMLS grant to the University of Denver and the Colorado Digitization Project, to develop a coordinated multi-state set of metadata standards for digital projects; Chuck chaired the work of the Technical Metadata Working Group.

As a consequence of his work with the Western States Digital Standards Group, Chuck recommended that the MDL project review the Western States Dublin Core Metadata Element Set to replace interim standards developed by the working group shortly after the August 2001 meeting. Before his recommendation could be discussed, Chuck became the Digital Initiatives Librarian at Florida State University. The Steering Committee later discussed and adopted the *Western States Digital Imaging Best Practices* (available online at http://www.cdpheritage.org/resource/scanning/documents/WSDIBP_v1_2003-01-13.pdf) and the *Western States Dublin Core Metadata Best Practices* (available online at http://www.cdpheritage.org/resource/metadata/documents/WSDCMBP_v1-2_2003-01-20.pdf). As noted elsewhere, these documents were also adopted by the MINITEX/LDS Standards Task Force.

The “Introduction to Metadata” Workshop mentioned under Goal 1, presented the Western States best practices as the foundation upon which the MDLC would build its signature project. The Steering Committee, in response to the positive reception of the Rochester workshop, is planning additional workshops on metadata and scanning best practices as goals in the 2003-04 LSTA grant application.

Activities related to Goal 4: Provide opportunities for a variety of enhancements

- Tasks: 1) Conceptual and Phase 1 development of application tool (which will allow people to select digital text or image object through central database, use Web-based template to select from available metadata about the objects and load additional metadata for personal annotations, and export to HTML pages for loading on remote server)
2) Interface design and implementation for prototype of central database

Outcome: A prototype or working version of the digital library’s first and primary program for allowing people to work with its collections

All of the tasks associated with Goal 4 were inter-dependent with goals and tasks in an IMLS application, which was not funded, and overly ambitious without additional funds. The proposed tasks were redefined and incorporated into the charges for the Applications and Audiences and the Architecture working groups. All of the activities related to this goal were incorporated into the 2003-4 LSTA grant application. To support that work, the Steering Committee received permission to redirect the grant allocation to purchase a Sun E3000 and SunFire V100 servers to support redevelopment of IMAGES at U of M and implementation of *Minnesota Reflections*. In addition, the Steering Committee received permission to redirect the grant allocation to acquire four HP Evo D530 workstations (with 2.6GHz, 512Mb RAM, 40Gb HD, 4 x 4.7Gb DVD+R/+RW drive, 19-inch monitor), two Expression 1640XL flatbed scanners (12.2 x 17.2 inch, 1600 x 3200 dpi, 12800 dpi interpolated), Nikon Super CoolScan 800ED 35mm film scanner, and associated hardware and software. This equipment was acquired to support regional digitization efforts for *Minnesota Reflections*. Two digitization workstations have been set up in St. Cloud to support continuing digitization there.

Evaluation Report & Expenditures (LSTA FY2002) p.3: System/Library_____

- B. List the objectives from the original proposal and describe the end results or outcomes for each objective.
Include any changes made to the project objectives and outcomes during the year.

Goal #1 – Identify Partners and create governance structure

Tasks: 1) Explore policy and governance options
2) Conduct cost analysis

Outcome: A Plan for making the Minnesota Digital Library a separate, viable entity complete with business plan, partners and decision making procedures.

Completed in part. The Steering Committee, through monthly meetings, has largely provided a more concrete vision, designed a significant signature project that promotes widespread participation and collaboration, selected a scalable digital asset management system that will be redeveloped to support the initial stages of the project, and defined a sustainable organizational and project structure. The articulation of the final business plan and organizational structure is dependent upon the selection of a project director and will be completed during 2004. The project director's position description has not been finalized, but many of the tasks and responsibilities have been defined. The MDLC offered three workshops and held a second planning conference to increase awareness and knowledge about digitization projects and create a more vital MDLC community. MDLC also registered four domain names and created a temporary virtual server for <http://www.mndigital.org> to house the Web site.

Goal #2 – Conduct Assessments

Tasks: 1) Identify/inventory collections: identify object types in existing and potential collections
2) Survey/identify users: develop survey tool, work with consultant

Outcome: Specific understanding of audience need for a centralized, statewide cooperative digital library project. Project plan in place for acquisitioning current digital collections into this library and digitizing important collections to make them available through this library

Completed. As noted in the project narrative under A above, the MDLC completed a statewide survey of collections and interest in digitization. While not yielding sufficient specifics about individual collections, there was adequate information to target specific collections for follow-up and more detailed analysis in preparation for digitization.

Goal #3 – Establish standards

Tasks: 1) Review and adopt metadata standards, object selection standards, standard procedures
2) Adapt existing University of Minnesota crosswalk scheme and database for use by MDL
3) Review and adopt standards for digital image quality
4) One-day workshop for potential participants in MDL to raise awareness about participating in and managing digitization projects

Outcome: Have in place technical standards for using metadata, establish functioning crosswalks between collections, begin training and create awareness of the digital library project

Completed. Best practices for imaging and standards for metadata were adopted and a workshop titled "Introduction to Metadata," based on those best practices was delivered. Metadata crosswalks at the University of Minnesota will be adapted as IMAGES migrates to an OpenSource environment and modified based on needs of pre-existing or local databases that wish to participate in the MDLC. As the MDLC begins to work with more complex digital objects, large

format maps, multi-page text, text transcriptions and translation, audio and video files, and other objects, project managers need to be vigilant in maintaining the currency and completeness of these best practices and standards.

Goal #4 – Provide opportunities for a variety of enhancements

Tasks: 1) Conceptual and Phase 1 development of application tool (which will allow people to select digital text or image object through central database, use Web-based template to select from available metadata about the objects and load additional metadata for personal annotations, and export to HTML pages for loading on remote server)
2) Interface design and implementation for prototype of central database

Outcome: A prototype or working version of the digital library's first and primary program for allowing people to work with its collections

Incomplete; goal and outcomes changed. This portion of the grant was contingent upon an IMLS grant that was not funded; as a consequence, it was overly ambitious within this grant. The allocation for this goal went to support additional workshops to create a knowledgeable digitization community, a consultant contract with John Price Wilkins, University of Michigan Digital Library Production Service, to advise MDLC Steering Committee on developments to date, and the acquisition of servers and digitization workstations to support the next phase of the MDLC project, *Minnesota Reflections*.

C. Give the actual number of persons directly served by the project.

The number of people directly served by this project is limited to the MDLC Steering Committee, participants in the three workshops (about 100), and participants at the annual planning conference (about 100). The potential impact of *Minnesota Reflections*, (this grant supported, in part, the development of the foundations of this collection project), is very large, potentially serving most adults and school students in Minnesota as well as more limited numbers of people outside of Minnesota.

6. What plans, if appropriate, have you made for follow-up or continuation of this project?

The MDLC Steering Committee submitted a 2003 LSTA grant application to support numerous projects, including redevelopment of IMAGES; digitization of between 5,000 and 10,000 images; digitization and accessibility of complex large images (maps); additional community building through training, an annual conference, and support of the MINERVA conference; support for a project director; and support for continuing meetings of the Steering Committee. The Committee is also exploring additional avenues of financial support; MnSCU, for example, has promised \$7500 for continuing MDLC development. The U of M has installed a server for MDLC development and initiated a review of IMAGES in preparation for migration to OpenSource.

7. Expenditures on the project from all sources (Breakdown expenditures for LSTA portion only):

	LSTA	State	Local	Other	Total
Personnel	\$11,532.94		\$54,597		
Library Materials					
On-line Resources					
Equipment* and Furniture					
Telecommunications					
Automation Hardware*	\$18,589.30				
Automation Software*	\$725.12				
Staff Development					
Supplies	\$528.18				
Contractual*	\$6,563				
Other*	\$10,043.70				
Total	\$47,982.24				

*Attach documentation.

8. In retrospect what would you have done differently? What would have made this a better project?

Designing the activities of one grant to be contingent upon receipt of another grant is foolhardy; we learned a valuable lesson. It is also difficult to predict with any accuracy external expectations that may divert attention or lesson a person's commitment to a project. In particular, many people on the Steering Committee were affected by the implementation of a new statewide integrated library system. Also, many of the people on the Steering Committee are in leadership positions in their home institutions and in high demand so their time for Steering Committee meetings is difficult to coordinate. Nonetheless, everyone is committed to the MDLC and has been able to clear calendars and actively participate. If anything would have made this a better project it would have been a half-time director who could have dedicated more time to research issues, post background papers for the Steering Committee, and attended to details often overlooked. The Steering Committee recognizes this shortcoming and has addressed it in the 2003 LSTA grant application.

9. Attach to this form any materials 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. If your project resulted in bibliographies, brochures, handbooks, catalogs, etc. please attach a copy of each.

10. We, the undersigned certify that the data and information contained in this report are true and correct to the best of our knowledge and belief.

Date

Board President

Date

Administrator