dLOC Executive Board Meeting
Meeting Agenda

University of South Florida      5:00pm, June 2, 2011

1. dLOC Update
   a. Newsletter to promote and document dLOC activities
   b. Subcommittees
      i. Technical Standards and Training
         1. Metadata Guide in Process
         2. New Online Tools in Final Stage of Development
      ii. Teaching and Outreach
         1. Conferences
         2. K-12 Outreach
      iii. Development
         1. Haiti Island Luminous Grant for Digital Exhibit
         2. Center for the Humanities and the Public Sphere Library Enhancement Grant
         3. Florida International University Technology Fee Award
   c. New Partner Invitation

2. Funding Structure
   a. Membership Levels for Financial Supporters
   b. Draft Letter to Libraries

3. Executive Committee
   a. Elections
   b. Length of Terms
   c. Length of Leadership and Succession

4. Bylaws
   a. Change of fiscal year
   b. Incorporate Changes to Election Procedure

5. 2011/2012 Goals and Plans

6. Any Other Business
dLOC Executive Board Meeting
Meeting Minutes

University of South Florida  5:00pm, June 2, 2011

Attendees:
Margo Groenewoud (Vice-chair, Netherlands Antilles Library) and Joy Ysaguirre (Chief Librarian, Belize National Library Service and Information System) were not in attendance

Introductions:
Executive Board:
Chair: Jean Wilfrid Bertrand, Director, Archives Nationales d'Haïti
Secretary: Dr. Mark Greenberg, Director of Special & Digital Collections, University of South Florida
Barry Baker, Director of Libraries, University of Central Florida
Astrid Britten, Director, Biblioteca Nacional Aruba
Maureen Newton, Caribbean Community Secretariat
Dulce María Nuñez, Director, Biblioteca, Pontificia Universidad Madre y Maestra
Past-Chair (non-voting): Judith Rogers, Manager, Library and Faculty Technology Services, University of the Virgin Islands (UVI)

Administrative Host Institution:
Laurie Probst, Dean of Libraries, Florida International University (FIU)
Brooke Wooldridge, Coordinator of the Digital Library of the Caribbean, Florida International University (and Spanish translator for the meeting)

Technical Host Institution:
Judith Russell, Dean of Libraries, University of Florida
Laurie Taylor, Technical Director for the Digital Library of the Caribbean, University of Florida

Minutes

Meeting began at 5:15pm

dLOC Update
1. Newsletter to promote and document dLOC activities
i. Garrison: offered to host the dLOC newsletter in the USF DigitalCommons site to increase distribution and to aid with the workflow process. dLOC newsletter is in dLOC, which is crawled and indexed by Google and other major search engines. The cost for USF with BePress/DigitalCommons is $1,500 for every new journal. The Executive Board will investigate options.

b. Discussion on what to include in the newsletter:
   i. Probst: Stories of how scholars are using dLOC
   ii. Russell: Presentations and publications are very useful
   iii. Russell: New projects like LLMC Digital

2. Subcommittees, grants and development, and new partner invitation updates provided by Wooldridge.
   a. Subcommittees
      i. Technical Standards and Training: Metadata Guide in Process. This is a simple 12 point guide, a sort of primer, is almost complete for use with the extensive documentation already complete. The dLOC Toolkit has moved online.
      ii. Teaching and Outreach: Conferences and K-12 Outreach: Wooldridge provided an overview of the work that’s being done. Ongoing need to develop more teaching opportunities within and especially outside of Florida.
      iii. Development
         1. Haiti Island Luminous Grant for Digital Exhibit: dLOC received private funding through FIU to create an online exhibit that curates materials in dLOC on Haitian history for education and outreach.
         2. Center for the Humanities and the Public Sphere Library Enhancement Grant: dLOC received funds for the digital acquisition of content from a researcher at UF to digitize and host materials from the National Library of Jamaica. This is a model project for digital acquisition done by funding digitization, and dLOC hopes to expand on this because of the benefit to all involved.
         3. Florida International University Technology Fee Award: FIU received a technology fee for $16,000 per year for 3 years for student workers, translations, digitization/server space.
   b. New Partner Invitation: revised and a copy is in the meeting packet after the PHPI newsletter. The content is primarily the same with minor changes and updates to the new look. Request for comments/changes to the invitation now or at any time. This is on the dLOC website and can be personally sent by request.

3. Funding Structure
a. Membership Levels for Financial Supporters
   i. Types of supporters
      1. dLOC Partners support with content
      2. dLOC Members support with funding (can also support with content)
   ii. Access
      1. There will be no loss of access. All materials will remain freely and fully available as open access.
   iii. Funding
      1. Discussion about setting up Foundation account at FIU to receive charitable support for dLOC.

b. Draft Letter to Libraries
   i. Wooldridge:
      1. Sample funding levels are in the packet just after the new partner invitation. This document was created to start the conversation about what member level funding would look like. Thankfully we started these conversations 1-2 years ago.

A few weeks ago, we received news from TICFIA that the program was cancelled, not at the end of the funding cycle, but at the end of this grant year, on September 30, 2011.

The document in the packet identifies a supporting and sustaining member level and different costs for US and Caribbean member levels.

Conversations since this was created have stated that there needs to be additional funding levels in the letter because the jump is too high.

ii. We need to distinguish between PARTNERS and MEMBERS. Partners would be those who contribute to building the content in dLOC. Members would support financially. Partners can also be members. This allows institutions and individuals that don’t have content to still support dLOC and help it to grow.
   1. Taylor: For terminology clarification, could “advocate” be used?
   2. Russell: No. The terms and terminology need to be in known categories for fiscal offices to smoothly process payment - “member” works whereas “advocate” would not.

iii. Rogers: Are we discussing restricting content?
iv. Russell: No. Research libraries are sensitive to the fact of the need to sustain. This is the model with open source software and others.
v. Probst: It’s a good citizen, good stewardship model. It’s not a quid pro quo. It’s really a “we see some value in the organization and we’d like to be part of supporting the organization”. It’s not tied to access. The fundamental value of dLOC is that it’s open access to these resources. It’s just a matter of adding another layer or opportunity for others to promote and perpetuate dLOC. It’s a fundamental value.

vi. Nuñez: Partners can also contribute by promoting the opportunity to support dLOC to individuals in their country for individuals.

vii. Garrison and Probst: Discussion is whether to establish a nonprofit or foundation to ensure individuals can receive a tax deduction for any donations. Can this run through universities and/or how would an alternative need to be set up to ensure that dLOC would still be eligible for grants? There will be further investigation on this.

viii. Russell: LLMC-Digital project supporters were supporting the same model. First supporting this intellectually, and then financially.

ix. Rogers: What happens to Brooke?

x. Probst: That’s recognized as paramount. We have to retain Brooke. We need to sustain her and I’m working on that. We need to have this conversation so that we can have other sources to ensure that we have permanent funding to sustain dLOC ongoing, but I think we need 3 years to make this happen.

xi. All: Unanimous agreement and on the need to retain Brooke (and not simply the position) because of her excellence.

xii. Garrison and Russell: For those who would be partners and members (or just members), we would need to ask for a commitment for 3 years to ensure we could put other supports in place. We don’t want to keep coming back to this every year.

xiii. Russell: It’s important to make sure that everyone knows that we are not changing the fundamental model. We want to know how partners in the Caribbean will feel about this model and if this is workable and appropriate?

xiv. Rogers: I tend to speak both languages: Caribbean and US. I think partners will agree with this. They’ve seen the value of dLOC and not only for researchers, but also for those working in this region. I think they’ll also understand

xv. Wooldridge: Do the funding levels look appropriate?

xvi. Rogers: They look good to me.

xvii. Rogers and Russell: It makes sense to include three funding levels for both US and Caribbean partners.

xviii. Greenberg: Might we want to think about membership and governance? Does it offer rights in governance for supporting institutions?
xix. Russell: This is a **content partnership** organization. The different levels may allow for digitization/selection of content. It may be that we have 1 board member seat that represents all member/not-partners. There would not be a representative from each partner-financial-supporter.

xx. Baker: Also, the member/partner is the ideal.

xxi. Probst: This is still a partner-driven/content-driven organization.

xxii. Russell: In the first paragraph of the letter, we need to make obvious that **OPEN ACCESS** remains (bold or otherwise emphasize this). This is a formatting issue, but we want to make sure it’s unequivocal.

xxiii. Rogers: There will be members who contribute rich resources but who may not be able to contribute money.

xxiv. Russell: We need to express in the bylaws that content is the driving force. This is still going to be a partner-driven organization.

xxv. Probst: **Those who hold and share the content are the ones building the resource. This is a partner-driven organization.**

xxvi. Greenberg: The Stanford encyclopedia uses this sort of model.

xxvii. Taylor: As do HathiTrust, Cornell’s arXiv, and TRAIL.

xxviii. Baker: We need to be careful about what we say in the bylaws.

xxix. Probst, Rogers, and Wooldridge: The executive board makes the decision on this. I think we should formally make the decision that we move forward, pending discussion of the general board tomorrow, with follow-up after to clarify in the bylaws.

xxx. Russell: I move that the Executive Board recommend to dLOC General members (partners) at the June 3 meeting adoption of the funding structure as amended this evening.

xxxi. Newton: seconded

xxxii. Passed unanimously.

xxxiii. Executive Board institutions that committed their partner (financial) support during the meeting: UF, FIU, UCF, UVI, USF

4. Executive Committee
   a. Elections
   b. Length of Terms
   c. Length of Leadership and Succession
      i. Wooldridge: This was not established before and now needs to be done because Newton is retiring. Board should have 9 representatives: 3 named positions and 6 member positions.
      ii. Baker: Each person serves 3 years with staggered terms for 1/3 to go off every year. That’s pretty standard and less than 3 years is not enough. It could be longer if wanted.
iii. Wooldridge: Current board started in 2008. Is everyone in their position willing to continue to serve? Everyone does wish to continue, so someone will be randomly selected to cycle off.

iv. Baker: Board members can have 2 successive terms, but must then remain off for 1 year before being on the Executive Board again.

v. Wooldridge: With all of this agreed to, will follow up for holding elections.

5. Bylaws
   a. Probst and Wooldridge recommended changing fiscal year from the grant year to the academic fiscal year. This was accepted.
   b. Wooldridge: With the Executive Board’s staggered terms, there may be minor changes in the election procedure. She will check and update the Board if needed.

6. 2011/2012 Goals and Plans
   a. New projects on the horizon include:
      i. Russell: UF will be collaborating with LLMC-Digital to digitize Cuban Law and then future projects as well.
      ii. Wooldridge encouraged everyone to send her new projects for inclusion in the newsletter.

7. Any Other Business