

Empire State Digital Network
Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 15, 2014
1:00pm to 4:30pm

Meeting Minutes

In-person meeting, hosted by METRO

Present: Mark Colvson (SUNY New Paltz), Liza Duncan (New York State Library), John Hammond (NY 3Rs Association, Inc.), James Neal (Columbia University Libraries), Josh Hadro (New York Public Library), Kathleen Roe (New York State Archives), Polly Thistlethwaite (CUNY Graduate Center)

Staff: Jason Kucsma, Anne Karle-Zenith, Kerri Willette,

Guests: Nick Graham (North Carolina Digital Heritage Center)

The meeting began with introductions and a brief project summary. There was an initial question and answer period where members raised general questions about the project and other larger policy concerns.

Initial questions posed by the committee included:

- What types of content will ESDN be accepting? How will we prioritize content types? Will content include born-digital objects? (Neal).
- Who is the target audience for contributed content? (Roe).
- What constitutes a DPLA-ready collection? (Thistlethwaite).
- What do we mean by contextualize? (Colvson).

Larger policy questions included:

- How will ESDN handle rights/succession rights?
- What approach will ESDN take around intellectual freedom and content control (i.e. pornographic content)?

Nick Graham, Program Coordinator for North Carolina Digital Heritage Center, the DPLA hub for the state of North Carolina spoke to the group about the hub experience in NC. The North Carolina Digital Heritage Center is a statewide digitization and digital publishing program that works with cultural heritage institutions across North Carolina to digitize and publish historic materials online. In 2013, the NC Digital Heritage Center also became a DPLA hub. In their role as a hub, they function similarly to ESDN in that there is no public facing element. They act as an aggregator that harvests metadata and passes it to DPLA. Their content requirements are based solely on what DPLA will and will not accept. Nick addressed multiple topics including: project funding (currently from LSTA, no initial Knight Foundation funding); minimum standards for contributed metadata (title and rights statements are the only required fields); data model (based on MODS and adapted from Boston Public Library); contributor make-up (include 148

institutions, larger private universities more than small private or public organizations); and metadata remediation.

The following questions and topics were raised for discussion in response to Nick's presentation:

- Every contributing institution required some level of metadata remediation.
- Better usage demographics and analytics could help direct where potential funding sources might be.
- Creation of simpler rights statements may increase collection usage. Partners should be encouraged to update/simplify their rights statements (waiting on DPLA/Europeana for recommendations). DPLA's CC0 requirement is for the metadata not for contributed items. This is often a point that needs to be explained to contributors.
- North Carolina has uploaded approximately 100,000 titles.
- Collection materials include primarily text-based content and some oral histories. DPLA is not currently accepting EAD.
- Traffic to North Carolina collections has not seen a large increase. However traffic to NYPL collections has seen an increase in traffic and some hubs have seen double their traffic. This may relate to the quality of contributed metadata.

Committee Business

Feedback to Phase 1 Project Plan

Willette asked the committee to provide feedback on the April 8, 2014 version of the Phase 1 Project Plan.

The following points were raised for discussion:

- Need for a communication plan (Neal):
 - Raise the project profile outside of the library community.
 - Once the number of items hits 1 million, target press, government, and the general public audiences.
 - Communication about ESDN needs to clearly contextualize DPLA (use communications to educate about DPLA and it's importance).
 - Provide templates for participants that show pride in participation.
 - Publicise how to contribute.
- Clarification on how decisions are made within the governing groups (Roe):
 - No formal bureaucratic structure. Committees will make recommendations (by vote if absolutely necessary) to ESDN project staff.
 - Decisions will be documented and posted publicly for transparency.
- Questions about how institutions and individuals that are not members of the NY 3Rs can participate (Thistlethwaite):
 - Contributions will be funnelled through the NY 3Rs councils initially.
- Questions about the mention of a "subscription" model in the phase two description. (Roe):

- Implies there will be subscription charges for non-member institutions that contribute through the councils. This is something we should start thinking about and clarifying now.

Review Committee Charge and Define Goals

Committee reviewed their charge. Goals for the first year were defined as follows:

- Building partnerships statewide - especially in areas related to project technology:
 - Identify in-kind contributors (i.e. fellowships, shared labor, interns).
 - Contributing shared technology may incentivise project participation.
 - Identify potential University partners (especially upstate).
 - Consider forming a technology working group to further build relationships and add support.
- Project sustainability and funding:
 - May need to define a development strategy soon.
 - Approach national and NY based funding bodies.
 - Consider partnering with a corporate vendor.
 - DPLA may be seeking more funding from the Knight Foundation.
- Rights statements:
 - Committee will review the ESDN data exchange agreement with DPLA when a draft is in place.
 - Memorandum of Understanding with partner institutions:
 - Committee recommended using the letter model that is employed in North Carolina. Duke is drafting a template letter for NC now that they will share with us when it is complete.
 - Test the letter out at the home institutions of advisory council members to see how their legal people react.
 - Use the language in the current MOU draft as an informative document for participants but not a contract they need to sign.
- Community outreach:
 - Group suggests outreach to media for promotion.
 - Direct communication efforts on specific audiences:
 - ESDN contributors.
 - Libraries, archives, museums communities.
 - DH and Developers.
 - General public.
 - Other outreach suggestions in response to Project Plan above.

Elect a committee chair

The group decided not to elect a chair. Meetings will be facilitated by ESDN staff going forward.

Schedule next meeting

The next meeting will be a conference call format to be held in late-September or early-October. Willette will send a Doodle poll to the group to gauge availability.