



OHIO DIGITAL PUBLIC LIBRARY OF AMERICA (DPLA) WORKING GROUP REPORTS FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

April 29, 2016

Prepared for the Ohio DPLA Steering Committee
by Liz Bishoff, The Bishoff Group, and
Tom Clareson, LYRASIS

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Key Recommendations	2
Working Group Recommendations	3
Governance Working Group	3
Overview of Governance Structure	3
The Initial Community Engagement Centers:	3
Technical Working Group	4
Metadata Working Group	4
Legal Working Group	5
Advocacy Working Group	7
Sustainability Working Group	7

Introduction

As part of the Ohio Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) planning grant, 6 working groups¹ were established to explore a range of activities needed to develop the Ohio DPLA Service Hub. The working groups, composed of representatives from Ohio's libraries, archives, historical societies and museums, worked from fall, 2015 through spring, 2016 addressing issues including technology, metadata, legal issues, sustainability and advocacy. The working group chairs were all members of the Ohio DPLA Planning Grant Steering Committee. The Steering Committee met monthly and was able to review the progress of the working groups.

The working group members actively participated in a statewide DPLA symposium and helped analyze the results of a statewide survey. The results of the work of these groups, along with the project's surveys and symposium will help formulate the Ohio DPLA application for the Ohio Service Center/Hub.

The following report includes the summary key findings of the working groups and the recommendations. The full reports of the working groups can be found at the Ohio DPLA project website <http://www.dplaohio.org/main:documents>.

The Ohio DPLA project was funded in part through a federal Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grant, awarded by the State Library of Ohio to the Columbus Metropolitan Library.

Key Recommendations

- The State Library of Ohio will be the administrative and fiscal lead for the initial three year prototype project. A multi-faceted governance structure is recommended that will involve the full range of Ohio DPLA partners, including established library and cultural heritage organizations, OhioLINK and Ohio History Connection; and individual organizations such as the Digitization Hubs at the public libraries in Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus and Toledo. Several working groups will continue to support the development of the Ohio DPLA initiative.
- The Ohio DPLA Service Center will establish a central site to aggregate digital collection metadata from Ohio's libraries and cultural heritage organizations. The purpose of the site will be to harvest the metadata from Ohio DPLA contributors and pass the metadata to DPLA. During the initial three year prototype there will not be public access to the aggregated metadata.
- After exploring a variety of options, the Technology Working Group recommended use of Repox aggregation software, and continue to monitor the aggregation software environment, which is rapidly developing.
- Ohio DPLA Metadata Application Profile has recommended a minimum set of required elements in keeping with the DPLA Metadata Application Profile. A set of best practices based on the Pennsylvania DPLA profile is recommended.
- Metadata normalization will be the responsibility of the local institutions rather than of the central site. Ohio DPLA staff and the working group members will be available to assist local libraries in understanding normalization requirements.

¹ Six working groups were Advocacy, Governance, Legal, Metadata, Sustainability, Technology

- To better understand the cost of DPLA participation, the sustainability working group recommended that the Executive Committee implement cost analysis program as soon as possible.
- The Governance Working Group recommends establishment of three Community Engagement Centers as support groups. The CECs will be based on type of organization: academic library; public library; and historical societies. Any organization interested in joining the Ohio's DPLA initiative contacts a CEC, where they will be provided information on the initiative, the letter of agreement, information on training, etc.
- The Legal Working Group recommends that Ohio follow the model of several other hubs and use a letter of agreement for participation in the Ohio Service Center program rather than a contract.
- Several working groups recommended development of training programs on metadata, harvesting, rights management, as well as introductory programs on the DPLA and the Ohio DPLA program.
- For those organizations who were interested in digitizing their collections, all working groups recommended providing clear information available for how those organizations can undertake such initiatives so that their collections will eventually be available through DPLA.

Working Group Recommendations

Governance Working Group

The Governance Working Group recommended a multi-faceted governance, an Executive Committee, an Advisory Committee, and Working Groups. Governance would capitalize on the established library and cultural heritage organizations in Ohio, with their substantial history of working together collaboratively on many initiatives. The State Library of Ohio as the lead organization for the initial three year prototype would be actively engaged in all aspects of the governance, along with newly established Community Engagement Centers (CEC), which will play a liaison role for the Ohio DPLA Service Hub. These CECs will be located at existing organizations, OhioLINK, Ohio History Connection and the Ohio Digitization Hubs.

Overview of Governance Structure:

The State Library of Ohio will serve as the administrative and fiscal agent for the "Ohio Digital Network" DPLA project for the three year prototype, including providing central project management, metadata, and technology hub aggregation support. An Executive Committee and Advisory Committee will guide the organization and the State Library DPLA team. Community Engagement Centers will take on the tasks of advocacy, facilitation of training, communication with and organization of the communities of practice under their respective umbrellas. CECs will also supply members to the Executive and Advisory Committees.

The Initial Community Engagement Centers:

The Community Engagement Centers builds on the long established networking communities, **Ohio History Connection** (<https://www.ohiohistory.org/>), **OhioLINK** (<https://ohiolink.edu/>), and **Digitization Hubs: Public library community engagement centers** (<http://www.ohiodigihubs.org/>).

This CEC structure is extensible allowing for an additional Ohio organizations to be added to represent museums; or they can be incorporated into one of the existing community centers, such as Ohio History

Connection. Alternately, organizations can affiliate with another CEC for example museum or public library could become affiliated with an academic organization for actual metadata contribution/content hosting, with the understanding that they would be represented by the host's community engagement organization.

Recommended Governance Structure for the Prototype Period:

- **Executive Committee:** An Executive Committee will be made up of the director or designee from the State Library of Ohio, the director or director-level designee from each CEC, the Chair of the Advisory Committee, and the DPLA project manager. Their main focus will be managing funding, sustainability, and program development.
- **Advisory Committee:** An Advisory Committee will be made up of director or executive level leaders from the members represented by the CECs, along with the DPLA project manager, and the chair/s of designated working groups. The Advisory Committee will review and recommend policies associated with funding, sustainability, and program development as well as other policy decisions. The Advisory Committee will consist of 11 members, 2 members from each CEC, the working group chairs, the DPLA project manager, and the Executive Committee chair.
- **Working Groups:** Cutting across these organizational engagement groups, we propose three statewide working groups based on practitioner expertise in metadata, technology, and advocacy to ensure that expertise and communication benefits all participants. The working group chairs will sit on the Advisory Committee.

Technical Working Group

- *DPLA-OHIO should manage their own technical stack for the initial 3-year pilot, and Repox represents DPLA-OHIO's best option for a locally hosted technology stack*
- *Technical infrastructure decisions need to remain flexible and easily fungible*
Remember, this is a 3-year pilot and the technology environment and available options will change.
- *The DPLA-OHIO program should include a standing technology working group, comprised of members representing participating communities.*
- *Metadata remediation will primarily be a local concern; remediating at the center will be minimal, and as needed during the 3-year pilot*
- *OCLC needs to be explored as a partner*
Given the significant number of potential Ohio DPLA contributors that utilize CONTENTdm and Ohio's unique connection to OCLC, DPLA-OHIO should actively work with OCLC to identify areas of potential collaboration.
- *Evaluate additional ways to facilitate access and discovery to the primary resources about Ohio*

Metadata Working Group

- As Ohio does not have statewide metadata guidelines in place, the Metadata Working Group recommends adapting the Pennsylvania Digital Collections Project (PDCP) PA-DPLA Metadata

Guidelines for use in Ohio. See [Proposed Metadata Best Practices](#) and [Proposed Metadata Application Profile](#) sections of the Working Group report for more details.

- The Ohio project must provide metadata best practices and guidelines to participating institutions and they should be presented as clearly as possible. Some additional materials may need to be created to assist specialized institutions (museums, historical societies) with metadata standards. In addition to a Metadata Application Profile, a Metadata Best Practices document should be created.
- The required metadata fields for aggregation in Ohio platform should be kept minimal, in line with the requirements of DPLA.

Required:	Title, Rights
Required When Available:	Collection*, Language, Type
Strongly Recommended:	Date, Place, Subject
- Because of the complexity of metadata issues, compounded by the number of potential partners in a statewide DPLA Service Hub, a dedicated individual in a metadata specialist position will be critical throughout the pilot, and therefore should be accounted for in any proposed budget for the prototype phase of the Ohio project. If the prototype is successful, it will be important to review the value of this position and how it might need to change in the post-prototype program.
- The proposed Community Engagement Centers should facilitate professional development related to metadata remediation for institutions. This should be coordinated with the State Library and the Project Manager.
- Metadata remediation should occur at the participating institutions, remain the responsibility of the institution's staff, and be supported by Ohio's best practices and guidelines. This remediation may be considered an iterative process, with updates and improvements occurring over time, and with repeated metadata harvesting.
- A standing Metadata Working Group should be established for the Ohio Program and charged with creating documentation, sharing metadata best practices and monitoring metadata issues and potential changes to the DPLA MAP.

Legal Working Group

- Create a Collection Development Policy

Collection development policies are foundational documents created by institutions that hold special collections and archival items. A policy should be created to explain that individual institutions will be responsible for making any necessary copyright determinations/copyright clearances for material that will be accessible through Ohio's program and to serve as a guiding document for Ohio Service Center staff, Community Engagement Centers, and the Ohio Executive and Advisory Committees.

Many sections for content of this agreement were pulled from the partnership agreement created by the Indiana DPLA hub (http://www.in.gov/library/files/dig_colldev07.pdf). It is recommended for Ohio to use this policy as a reference document.

Suggested content for agreement includes:

- Mission Statement
 - Accepted Digitized Materials
 - Scope/Content: adheres to mission
 - Restrictions: address CCO and fair use
 - No duplicate records
 - Formats
 - Documentation/Description
 - Content collection priorities (optional)
 - Policy on removing items from hub
- Create a partnership agreement

A simple agreement in letter format should be created which addresses DPLA's requirement to access metadata linked to digital objects from the hub. The agreement should acknowledge that metadata from all contributed content will be accessed and made public to Ohio's "Ohio Digital Network" and DPLA.
 - Create an information document for potential contributing institutions

In order for institutions to participate, an understanding of governance and policies of both DPLA and Ohio's DPLA Service Center must be concise and clearly explained. This will reduce the number of questions or issues that may arise between Ohio's Service Center and participating institutions.

Many sections for content of this document were pulled from the partnership agreement created by the Mountain West DPLA hub (http://mwdl.org/docs/MWDL_Partnership_Agreement_ver12_2008-03-14.pdf). It is recommended for Ohio to use this policy as a reference document.

Suggested content for agreement

- Purpose of Agreement
 - Government Structure: responsibilities of participating organization, community engagement center, and project team as created by the Governance Committee
 - Copyright: follow *DPLA Data Use Best Practices* (<http://dp.la/info/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/DPLADataUseBestPractices.pdf>)
 - Metadata/Right Statements: follow *DPLA Recommendations for Standardized International Rights Statements* (http://rightsstatements.org/files/151002recommendations_for_standardized_international_rights_statements.pdf)
 - Procedures for a institutions that withdraws from hub
- Provide Training on Policies and Copyright

It is recommended that training on the following topics should occur during the three year prototype period: DPLA rights and philosophy, DPLA's *Getting it Right on Rights* Project, Creative Commons, copyright law, and resources for determining copyright.

Some training strategies could include using the train the trainer technique, creating a resources hub, and train on best practices in selecting collections.

Advocacy Working Group

- Project Name: We recommend that the project name be: “Ohio Digital Network²” formerly DPLA Ohio.
- Education: Participating organizations
 - Working groups should act in conjunction with Community Engagement Centers to plan and organize training and education.
 - To accommodate different learning styles, a variety of formats should be provided, including in person workshops, webinars, and how-to documents featuring screen captures.
 - Frequency of training sessions is dependent upon the topic. *Education - DPLA User Community*
 - Community Engagement Centers should work in conjunction with Ohio’s DPLA Community Representatives for outreach activities that involve the public’s use of Ohio’s DPLA collections.
 - *Activities for Community Engagement Centers*
- Outreach and Advocacy
 - Develop relationships with current and potential “Ohio Digital Network” contributors
 - Introduce organizations to the DPLA to garner interest and increase participation
 - Education--Plan and conduct training sessions as specified in guidelines above
 - Interactions with DPLA Community Representatives--Community Engagement Centers should work in conjunction with DPLA Community Representatives to increase interest in the DPLA within participating organizations’ user groups

Sustainability Working Group

- Sustainability should be the responsibility of the Executive Committee in order for long term sustainability issues to remain in the forefront. We suggest they form a subcommittee to focus on these activities.
 - The composition of the Executive Committee should include a member at large
 - Leadership of the Executive Committee should rotate
- In order to focus the subcommittee’s work, we recommend that the Executive Committee develop program goals for the 3 year prototype. Goals to consider include:
 - Determining total cost of implementing the Ohio DPLA Service Hub
 - Identifying a sustainable organizational structure
 - Determining how many organizations need to participate to cover costs
 - Determining an acceptable time horizon to recover costs
- Begin to monitor cost matrix elements at start of the project.

² The name “Ohio Digital Network” will be the working name. The Executive and Advisory Committees should verify the name.

It is imperative to track both actual and in kind costs; we want to be able to base decisions going forward on relatively realistic sense of costs. Therefore information gathering should occur quarterly throughout the 3 year prototype. It is also strongly recommended that all components are gathered monthly for the first quarter to ensure that information is set up and tracked effectively.

- Consider sustainability models and financial elements after the first year of the prototype with an eye towards being able to recommend a sustainability model at the end of year two. In this way a solution could be identified and partners nailed down for a smooth transition from year three to post prototype. Outline what happens in years 2, 3, 4 (prototype and beyond)