November 20, 2015

Ohio DPLA Steering Committee Meeting

Attendees: Nathan, Meghan, Missy, Katy, Liz, Angela, Janet C, Katrina, Tom C, Stephen, Chatham, Laurie, Terry, Meg D, Gwen

Symposium Update: Missy sent a brief written update, now full at 100 attendees, with one person on waiting list. Advocacy group reached out to the A-bucket list, now down to only 4 who aren’t attending. Handouts due end of next week. Advocacy will help stuff packets on Dec 2. If working group is planning to meet on 12/2, Missy and Angela need to know how many so can assign rooms, need to know if specific working groups need a conference phone. Working with Angela to see if funding can cover lunches on 12/2. If working group is meeting over lunch 12/2, we need to know. Let Missy know how many people need lunch.

Missy discussed the waiting list. The one person currently on the waiting list is from an organization that already has 2 people attending. Notified them that they need to decide if appropriate person is on the waiting list.

Working groups—everyone except Metadata is meeting on 12/2.

Governance, legal, sustainability 10-noon; lunch for these group; 1-3 meeting individually from 1-3; Technology meeting 1-3; Advocacy meeting to put packets together. We’ll create a final agenda.

Steering Committee meeting 3-5. We will have a separate agenda for this meeting.

Handouts need to be to Missy by 11/27. Angela will notify Emily and Kerri that handouts need to be to Missy by 11/27.

Reporting out at the end of the day: We wanted to focus the discussion of the small group sessions—the idea is to use the questions distributed previously to generate discussion in the breakout sessions and the final report-out, not that the working groups would answer the questions before the Symposium.

Survey discussion: Drafted a power point for the December 3 session. Sent to the steering committee 11/20. Asked for comments by 11/23. Will do final revisions of the survey next week. Need to discuss distribution of the survey. The survey results mirror other states, we were pleased with the response rate. Meghan and Katrina reported on their review of the survey. There are a number of questions that came out that we need more information on, including what metadata they used on legacy collections, more information on what collections are they using what schemas, etc. Have pulled together A-bucket list, list of D-bucket organizations that haven’t done any digitization but plan to, etc.

DPLA is broadening the scope of what they will collect, but Ohio needs to determine what we want to contribute, what early collections should we harvest. Should IR content be contributed? Maybe there aren’t restrictions on what’s contributed. It’s maybe more what we want to contribute.

The question for us is what group should tackle this issue. Legal is looking to see if any state has collection policy. It’s not just a collection development, maybe a strategic tool, we should identify the collections that should go first, make the biggest splash, maybe not show IR content first, it’s not maybe as compelling. Maybe each of the groups could think about it and we can talk about it on Dec 2nd. All the groups are thinking about it. How does it play out as far as possible grant funding—is Knight possibly interested in something? What are the strategic collections that might get us there? Pretty easy to flip the switch, make it available through OAI, pretty easy to highlight the strengths of a collection, if we have the technical capacity to pull in a large amount of material, it’s up to us to highlight the materials for grant funding. Collection development may be a non-starter issues, but we need to discuss the topic further at the December 2 meeting.

We have to prioritize if we have to help people get their metadata into shape. Maybe there’s a different priority for each of the groups. You want to be able to tell the A-bucket people with lots of records where to start—if tell people to clean up their metadata—need to tell them where to start. In 5 years we may send them everything – the purpose is to establish an order.

December would be the time for designing the next survey with launching the survey in January.

Education keeps coming up, it was suggested that Advocacy and Sustainability should look into the issue.

Governance-Legal call: The call was a plea for guidance, we asked that they look at the A-bucket list and develop some models for what governance models might work for Ohio.

Meghan reviewed the three models, we’ll distribute the models to the steering committee who can distribute them to their working group members, get them to contribute pros and cons. We’ll hope to have decision between December 3 and February. Meghan noted that hopefully once governance says what leaning towards it will be clear what the model is.

Metadata working group: Talked about the survey, need to work on the additional questions for the survey, particularly legacy metadata, standards for creating metadata.

Technology working group: Met and reviewed the models, discussed survey results, focusing on A-bucket list that have implemented OAI-PMH. Just because an institution may have a lot of metadata and OAI-PMH, we don’t know what their metadata looks like. Talked about symposium meeting and breakout session.

When reviewed the number of digital object—the initial survey didn’t ask if those are objects that people can get to—need to ask how many have limited access. We did ask if they were publicly accessible.

There may be a lot of retrospective work to be done -- we need to find out what the metadata looks like.

Focus of the second-round survey is to clarify if you’re an A-Bucket or not. Refine who we want to have a call with. Clarify if there are rights statements for collections from the A-Bucket institutions. Consider issues of Creative Commons CC0 for metadata and thumbnails.

Next Meeting: The decision on the date of the next conference call meeting will be made at the December 2 Steering Committee meeting.