# Governance Working Group Final Report April, 2016

- Executive summary (Final report)
- Working group charge and summary of groups activities

The Governance Working Group was charged with investigating a range of issues including the organizational structure of the DPLAOhio program, staffing, and management of the program. It worked closely with the sustainability and legal working groups on the organizational structure and funding. The group will investigate different options, making recommendations on how Ohio should structure its program.

Members of the committee:

Co-chairs: Janet Carleton, Ohio University Libraries and Gwen Evans, OhioLINK
Members: **Virginia Dressler**, Kent State University; **William Rutger**, Ashland Public Library; **Jenni Salamon**, Ohio History Connection; **Holbrook Sample**, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County; **Deanna Ulvestad**, Greene County Public Library; **Jane Wildermuth**, Wright State University; **Stephen Hedges,** OPLIN, liaison to the DPLA Steering Committee.

The group met in person and via conference calls, as well as participating in the DPLA in Ohio Symposium in December of 2015, including leading a breakout session for participants. Consultants Tom Clareson and Liz Bishoff also attended meetings, and Meghan Frazer, OhioLINK, was also very involved in the early part of the process. After review of other governance structures, internal discussions and discussions with the other working groups, we are recommending the following governance structure for the initial three years of DPLAOhio.

Given the existence of some long-standing library and cultural heritage organizations in Ohio, as well as their substantial history of working together collaboratively on many initiatives, we propose starting with the existing state and non-profit agencies as DPLA Community Engagement Groups.

The State Library of Ohio will serve as the administrative and fiscal agent for the DPLAOhio 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 (CECs) will take on the tasks of advocacy, training, communication with and organization of the communities of practice under their respective umbrellas. CECs will also provide the representatives for the Executive and Advisory Committees that will make up the formal governance structure. We wish to emphasize that these CECs are not meant to be overly restrictive as to the types of organizations they represent. There are libraries, both academic and public, that use Ohio Memory and may choose to interact with DPLAOhio through Ohio History Connection. There are libraries and cultural heritage organizations that have content in OhioLINK colleges and universities digital collections platforms. We envision that organizations that do not yet have existing relationships under the current proposed CECs will have choices open to them based on content platform (Ohio Memory or blended content).

The three initial CECs are:

 **Ohio History Connection** (https://www.ohiohistory.org/)

As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization chartered in 1885, the Ohio History Connection and the State of Ohio have maintained a longtime public-private relationship whereby the Ohio History Connection carries out dozens of history services for Ohio and its citizens.

With more than 180 staff members, hundreds of volunteers and thousands of partners in historical societies, local history groups and local and state government, it champions all Ohio history, including the more than 50 historic sites and museums in its network throughout Ohio.

Ohio Memory, utilizing CONTENTdm installation, is a collaborative project of the Ohio History Connection and the State Library of Ohio. In this, 26 organizations from around the state are active participants. Additionally, there are more 300 organizations that can be reached out to using the Ohio Local History Alliance network. (And more than 300 organizations of various types who participated when the site was a state bicentennial project in the early 2000s.)

**OhioLINK** (https://ohiolink.edu/)

A state agency under the Department of Higher Education, OhioLINK is the consortium of the 121 member libraries of 93 institutions of higher education in Ohio. Almost all colleges and universities in Ohio are members of OhioLINK. OhioLINK has a robust structure for community collaboration and communication, with a more than twenty year history of successful collaborative projects both within OhioLINK members and with other library organizations. These include as peer-to-peer physical resource sharing with SearchOhio as well as the Libraries Connect Ohio database project with OPLIN (public libraries) and INFOhio (K–12 libraries). OhioLINK and its member libraries have substantial digital collections and experience with collaborative digital platform projects such as the now-superseded Digital Media Center and the institutional repository program, the Digital Resource Center. Library staff members at member institutions have experience with DSpace, Fedora, CONTENTdm, BePress, and other platforms and are vocal and knowledgeable advocates of open access initiatives.

**DIGIHUBS: PUBLIC LIBRARIES COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CENTER**

OPLIN, the central organization representing public libraries in the DPLA planning process, has no experience with digitization. Instead, OPLIN has been fostering the development of "Digitization Hubs" at the public libraries in Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, and Toledo. These four hubs are interested in filling the role of a CEC for Public Libraries. For all of them, DPLAOhio work would be an extension of their current activities, including outreach and training, though with increased metadata work and an added role as centers for assisting libraries already doing their own digitization with the process of adding metadata to DPLA. In terms of representation in the governance structure, they will select one director from one of the Digihub libraries to represent this CEC on the Executive Committee.

Because the local connection is so important, libraries that demonstrate that they need little or no Quality Assurance and ingest help might eventually qualify as additional members of this Community Engagement Center in the geographic areas furthest from the current Digitization Hubs.

This CEC structure is extensible allowing for an additional Ohio organization to be added to represent museums; or they can be incorporated into one of the existing community centers, such as Ohio History Connection which already maintains close relationships with the Ohio Museum Association and Ohio Local History Alliance. Alternately, a 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. The small number of higher education institutions in Ohio which are not members of OhioLINK can either be represented by the OhioLINK CEC, potentially will host (or do host) content with Ohio Memory and can be represented by the Ohio History Connection, or may use the services of the public library Digihubs which are serving as regional CECs for public library, cultural organizations, and potentially academic institutions which are using their other digitization services.

**Proposed Governance Structure During Prototype Program:**

- 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 chairs 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. There shall be 2 members from each CEC for a total of 6, the Chair of each working group, the DPLA project manager, and the Chair of the Executive Committee. The Chair of the Advisory Committee shall be chosen from the CEC representatives in a vote by the Advisory committee members; the chairship shall rotate among the CECs so that leadership is equitably rotated among the different constituent groups. Under the current proposal, this advisory committee will consist of eleven members.  THE STATE LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVE WILL BE AN EXOFFICIO VOTING MEMBER; THE PROJECT MANAGER WILL BE AN EX-OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBER.

- Prototype Goals: During year three of the prototype, the Advisory Committee working with the Executive Committee will develop recommendations for a long-term sustainable governance structure for continuing DPLAOhio engagement.

- 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 Chairs of these three working groups will sit on the Advisory Committee.

**Background to key recommendations, including challenges and issues**:

Governance Structure:

- While many states organize geographically, Ohio has a long history of working through the existing organizations, and those organizations have a long history of collaboration. Using existing groups based loosely on type will allow the CECs to tailor their advocacy and education efforts to institutional types based on those different needs and issues. In addition, there are areas of the state (northwest, southeast) where it would be hard to identify a center which could easily support regional efforts.
- This structure allows for more flexibility in Ohio than may be apparent. There are existing aggregated content platforms that are in fact multi-type; for example, both public libraries and academic libraries can engage/become involved with DPLA through the Ohio History Connection/Ohio Memory content platform. Some academic library content collections include local historical society or museum collections. This allows Ohio and the relevant collaborating organizations to maintain existing relationships and also reach institutions geographically as appropriate.
- An advantage to this structure is that the focus of the CECs can remain on advocacy and education rather than on technology. The potential challenge, especially for the DigiHubs as a group public library CEC, is to find the staffing capacity to fulfill their respective roles.
- Both the State Library of Ohio and OhioLINK have explicitly identified participating in the DPLA as part of their strategic initiatives. The State Library of Ohio's mission is to serve all types of libraries in Ohio and is a charter member of the OhioLINK consortium. OhioLINK, the State Library of Ohio, OPLIN, and INFOhio, the K-12 library consortium, have a joint initiative of some years standing to provide databases and other digital content statewide. Collaborative and communicative relationships between the proposed CECs and leading organizations such as are strong and of long-standing in Ohio. OhioDIG (http://ohiodig.org), the Ohio interest group for digitization activities, is an active group in Ohio that brings together digital practitioners from academic, public, and special libraries, archives, and cultural heritage organizations. Members of the proposed CECs are well-represented in OhioDIG and it is another venue for information and advocacy to flow between groups.

**Funding**:

- The challenges for developing funding models for sustainability and support from members will be different for each CEC. However, this structure allows each organization to work out a model appropriate to it -- from supporting its activities with operating costs, membership fees, a cost-recovery chargeback model, etc.

**Advocacy & Education**:

- Challenges specific to museums, historical societies, and other smaller cultural heritage organizations are
  - Lack of knowledge of standards, best practices and policies. This can be addressed by the working groups which are cross-CEC, and the appropriate CEC.
  - Limited number of resources, including staffing, funding, and hardware/software including hosting platforms. The DigiHubs CEC could potentially address this, as they are positioned to help with actual digitization and would either directly support these organizations with resources or direct

them to the Ohio Historical Connection CEC. The Ohio History Connection has a multi-tenant hosting platform that is also available. The DigiHubs and The Ohio History Connection can act in complementary ways in this regard.

- Lack of clear communication and contact people at smaller organizations -- the Ohio Historical Connection as CEC and the DPLAOhio working groups would have to address this with awareness and advocacy campaigns.
- Lack of intellectual control over collections might limit their ability to digitize. This might be addressed moving forward with new collections by CEC advocacy and training on the necessary rights declarations, recommendations, etc.
- These types of organizations may be the furthest from readiness so will need more assistance throughout the entire digitization lifecycle.
- Fear of losing control of images if digitized and put on internet -- many museums and archives make money from reproductions.