

**Nevada State Library and Archives
Nevada Statewide Digital Advisory Committee**

January 28, 2010

University of Nevada Reno—Redfield Campus

9:30 am - 4:00 pm

Participants: Jason Vaughan (Chair), Sabrina Mercadante, Lauren Stokes, Jeanne Price, Michelle Mazzanti, Donnie Curtis, Anthea Humphreys, Dana Hines, Jeff Kintop, Daphne DeLeon, Karen Starr, Liz Bishoff

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions	15 minutes
Statewide Digital Initiative—Review and Update	35 minutes
Review work of this year	10 minutes
Nevada Statewide Digitization Working Groups	80 minutes
Portal to content	60 minutes
Newspaper digitization in Nevada	60 minutes
Plans for the next meeting	15 minutes
Meeting wrap-up	15 minutes

Meeting Record

Meeting Set-up: Liz Bishoff reviewed the meeting agenda with the committee.

Update on Committee Activities:

Jason Vaughan reviewed the activities of the committee since the fall – including three conference calls and drafting of three working group charges to begin work in 2010. The Committee has established a site which has been populated with most of the documents from the past years activities, as well as the work from this fall. Jason reviewed the goals of the program that are defined in the Statewide Plan.

FY10 LSTA Grant updates:

- Portal: Discussion occurred regarding the current portal developed after the Stakeholders meeting in Las Vegas and its need to be updated.
- A Statewide Project: Jason Vaughan noted that as he explored statewide newspaper projects, he found that successful projects generally had demonstrated collaboration and experience with newspaper digitization. Nevada has experience with newspaper digitization, but might need to demonstrate a collaborative approach. The original plan had called to pursue a statewide project in 2012, with the possibility of newspaper digitization being that project.
Action Item: Move forward sooner with a demonstration project and then move to federal funding.
- LTSA Project Pilot Project: A proposed pilot project involves UNR Library (Donnie Curtis), Sparks Museum (Anthea Humphreys), and Nevada Historic Society (Sherry Hayes-Zorn) and focuses on transportation in Northern Nevada, particularly railroads as they are critical to the economy. This pilot project would be the first step in the design for a larger project. Everyone agreed that the importance of this project is to design the bigger picture—create

the framework, understand how it allows for future expansion into the state, and how it fits into the standards work. Jeff Kintop suggested that Nevada Humanities might be interested in partnering on the topic of transportation.

- Training program: Committee discussed approaches to digital training. There was general agreement that training needs to start with the basics, demonstrate that digitization isn't so daunting. Rather than invent our own workshops the group agreed to look at online offerings. There could also be a speaker at state association meetings. The group agreed to reallocate some training funds to other activities. Group agreed that if people aren't doing digitization activities already, there are few people who are going to get into it at this point given the current economic crisis, so there is no sense in offering training if people can't implement projects. Jeff Kintop noted that museums digitize on demand, but they don't have a place to put the digital content. They need to identify a way of managing digital objects that aren't hosted online which could be a training topic.

FY11 LSTA Grant:

A proposal to extend the working group for another year was submitted as part of the LSTA grant process. There's enough work to be done to continue into FY11. The proposal includes funding for travel and training.

The ongoing sustainability of the committee will be funded through June 2011.

Action Item: A decision about governance of a digital initiative in the state will need to be framed by late 2010.

Working groups:

Jason Vaughan reported that draft charges for each of the working groups have been completed and posted. He thanked everyone who worked on the draft charges. The next step for the committee is to finalize these charges, identify a chair, and solicit participation in each working group. Each working group should probably have 6-10 people. The Advisory Committee agreed that participation should be open to any member of the Nevada cultural heritage community and to achieve that a notice will be sent to the directors of the Nevada libraries, museums, archives, historical societies, etc. soliciting participation.

Best practices/standards Working Group:

The advisory committee reviewed and approved the charge and strategies.

The following deliverables were agreed to:

- Review existing best practices from Maryland, Colorado, North Carolina and other states as identified.
- Develop minimum elements for an item—mandatory and optional
- Identify the different controlled vocabularies and steer people toward using them, with an eye toward being consistent.
- Make recommendation based on best practices and standards.

There was further discussion on training on best practices. Group suggested targeting training at the Nevada professional association meetings. The Nevada Library Association is in Henderson in October. Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists (CIMA) is the archives group which needs to be included as well as the Nevada Museum Association.

There was discussion about existing controlled vocabularies in use – such as:

- the Getty List,
- the Nevada Subject Heading List,
- the Art and Architecture Thesaurus (part of museum practices),
- the Chenhall Lexicon which is incorporated into Past Perfect; and
- Library of Congress's Graphic Materials 1 and 2.

The CDP has a list of approved vocabularies because different materials have different requirements.

Consensus: A critical underlying consensus of the group was that an organization should select a schema to use, identify and advertise what schema they are using, and be consistent.

Action item: Identify what's being used by Nevada Cultural Heritage Institutions (CHI) and at least advertise for the benefit of others – 'this is what's commonly used by Nevada CHIs.'

It was acknowledged that some mapping would need to occur during the harvesting process. Some fields will always be "free for all" fields. Liz Bishoff noted that the BCR (Bibliographical Center for Research) currently has a committee that will likely be creating a revised version of mandatory and optional metadata fields – the publisher field will likely go into the mandatory category to aid for harvesting purposes. They are also looking at the contributing institution field. They are looking at the Resource Description Framework (RDF) and how this is affecting Dublin core and the interchange of data. The Collaborative Digitization Program (CDP), Mountain West Digital Library (MWDL), and University of North Carolina (UNC) standards are geared toward the broad cultural heritage community and are not so library-centric.

For imaging specifications, it was recommended that minimal standards are created – never put in maximums for this (ex: the Maryland set of specifications puts in minimal standards).

Potential working group members: Cory Lampert (UNLV) has been approached and is likely willing to serve on this committee. Other suggested members included Karen Wikander (Nevada Humanities Committee, Editor of the Nevada Online Encyclopedia), Wendy Roseth (Henderson PL), and Vicki Tripp (Churchill County Library), Dana Hines (CLAN), Lauren Stokes, Sherry Hayes-Zorn, Glee Willis/Molly Beisler (UNR), Andrea Rossman (Churchill County Museum). It was acknowledged that some members would need to be brought up to speed and there would be a learning curve to help them best contribute.

Governance Working Group:

The Advisory Committee began by reviewing what do we need to do as a collaborative and if we understood that better then we could define the governance structure required to support those needs.

The following are the key needs:

- Portal that will take people to collections
- Creation of core documents that can help hook up institutions – "we can help you with this if you can do this for us" – e.g. benefits to each partner and understanding skills or and how different players can assist. With the creation of core documents also comes the need to maintain those documents.

- Standards/Best Practices to support access to collections
 - Creation and maintenance of documents
 - Access to documents
- Economic development opportunity
 - Funding option—Made in Nevada/digital version
- Networking—in-person; virtual
- Decision making—Advisory; Policy—recommend vs. approval
- Communication with Cultural Heritage Institution directors about digital issues
- Digital Association of Nevada—create an association for organizations doing digitization; if you follow the best practices / guidelines of this assoc, you could put a seal on your project.
- Grants for collaboration/statewide projects
 - In addition to LSTA Structure; for example, museums can't get LSTA funds, but they can get the larger IMLS funds.
 - It was mentioned that often a member of an organization could apply for grants on behalf of a group. Critical to all grants is that there must be a fiscal agent for things to run through. When thinking about a fiscal agent, you need to think about which entity would have the best success – name recognition, etc. – in trying to get the grant.
 - It was acknowledged that some funding streams are legislatively mandated to go through SHRAB, SCLL.
- Consider continuing with the current advisory structure at least for near term, 2-3 years
- Focus on having a major initiative digital initiative for 2014—demonstrate what can be accomplished – tied to Nevada's Sesquicentennial.
- In digital collaboratives, you often have folks that don't have content but are interested in playing. These partners can provide other things, like metadata expertise.

At this time, the Governance Working Group will be the existing advisory committee. It was acknowledged that the Advisory Board can help get buy-in to goals and advise.

Note: Wyoming, Alabama, the MWDL, and Texas all have interesting governance structures for digitization, in terms of where digital collaboratives have their homes. All multi-type consortia digital collaboratives are having difficulties maintaining themselves. Those that are sustaining themselves are embedded in existing, sustainable organizations. Colorado no longer has a multi-type collaborative – it didn't have a firm Colorado home. They tried as a not-for-profit and were unsuccessful. The Illinois collaborative is having a very difficult time, as are Massachusetts and New York.

Collaboration working group:

The Advisory Committee concurred with the charge and goals.

- Focus groups at museum and library associations. Could discuss what small organizations need and what barriers to organizations are.
- Workshops will be needed

The following deliverables were agreed to:

- White paper on benefits of collaboration
 - Why it's important for larger organizations to collaborate
 - Smaller organizations how to do it
- Have to provide focused consulting support for some people

- Transform the survey results into a different form so that the information is understandable to organizations.
- Expand the portal information for broader CHI community.
- Folks could create an inventory of past and in-progress collaborations. Some of this would be in survey data.

There is a need to understand issues and policies of individual institutions vis a vis those of a collaborative. The collaborative policies can be broad and general and need not speak to policies at individual institutions. For example, “an institution can participate in collaborative work if they provide a low-res image for access.” Access to the high resolution image would be dictated by CHI individual policy. We don’t want there to be any issues at the portal collaborative level with individual content provided by an institution. If there’s any issues with copyright, it should be the responsibility of the individual institution to have to deal with, not the collaborative.

Some principles of collaboration exist at the BCR website and also at the Iowa Heritage site.

Separate from a public portal, we could use the committee’s group site as our own portal to keep folks up to date on what individual CHIs are up to. At the next in-person meeting, we can talk about a few of the digital projects we’re each currently working on or looking at.

Potential working group participants: Michelle Mazzanti, Donnie Curtis, Sabrina Mercadante, Barbara Mathews, Churchill County Library; Mark Hall-Patten, Clark Co. Museum; Crystal Van Dee, Nevada State Museum Las Vegas; Jeff Kintop.

Portal:

Jason Vaughan began a brief discussion of the current way Nevada digital content is accessible. Most substantive effort that we have is at the Cooperative Libraries Automated Network (CLAN) where they show the other projects using Google’s custom search. He reviewed how a variety of institutions are providing access to the different projects. Discussion ensued about how to expand access and make it statewide. The question was raised regarding what a front end should look like. The committee looked at the model that Metropolitan New York Library Council used employing Omeka software.

Next steps:

Establish a domain name, create a collection record for each digital collection (pick an image and assign metadata; provide link to master, hosted collection at individual CHI site), link to the Google custom search, create a name for the site, and include the online Nevada encyclopedia. Initially, the site could include collections currently mentioned on the existing CLAN page.

There is no cost for the software. Jason Vaughan will talk UNLV staff about working on this and will investigate Omeka. He also mentioned UNLV will shortly be using Drupal for their digital collection homepage that highlights each of UNLV’s digital collections, so this might be an option as well. Grant can cover the cost of the domain name.

Follow-up:

Include in letter to directors include link with map with link to content. UNLV has updated the list of repositories in the state. This might be useful for the project.

Potential Statewide Project: Historic Newspapers digitization initiative:

Advisory Committee members shared their experience and activities associated with digitizing historic newspapers. Jeff Kintop reported that the Nevada State Library and Archives had set up a newspaper digitization service utilizing inmates. Due to Department of Corrections staffing changes, the project did not move forward. He also spoke to the “black box” approach of how such a project could work – outsourcing digitization, OCR, metadata, and getting the project back as a complete product (still need to load onto local hosting platform + provide interface wrapper, context, publicity). The Reno area has papers that meet the requirements for the NEH/LC project in that they are old enough, however most Las Vegas papers were published after 1922.

A big benefit of newspaper digitization is that it can give the residents of Nevada a perspective they cannot obtain from viewing the analog issues – digitization offers wonderful searching capabilities that are leaps and bounds beyond sitting at a microform reader and trying to find things. So, for any topic, instead of seeing one perspective from a single issue from a single location, you could easily see the perspective on that topic from multiple papers across multiple years across the state.

Liz Bishoff asked the group to do a quick analysis beginning with user needs, followed by specific audiences, barriers and solutions. Different states have different driving factors. For Utah, it was genealogy. For Colorado, it was general support of history. CONTENTdm and Olive software are both key players with newspaper digitization.

User needs:

- Obituaries
- Genealogy
- Locating buildings
- Historical studies (such as validating past ownership of buildings and land to deal with property holding issues)
- Other business applications

Audiences:

- Students
- Genealogists
- Businesses
- Faculty
- Librarians
- Authors
- Private Investigators
- Lawyers

Opportunities -- Nevada project should:

- Get Southern Nevada content
- Get more content from Northern Nevada newspapers
- Build on what has already been done
- More content faster and of higher quality
- Bring all content together
- Encourage historical research and respond to expressed research needs
- Have a preservation component

Questions to ask: Important questions to be considered in a future project include:

- How do we leverage what’s already been done?

- How do we incorporate post -1923 newspaper?
- How can we do a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) project with their limitations, such as microfilm that has deteriorated and newspapers that fall outside the pre-1923 dates? Other states have chosen not to adhere to the rules of the NEH program and so did not pursue an NEH project (for example, only page level indexing and not article level). NEH only provides up to \$300k; which is a start but by no means was enough, in Colorado's case, to digitize 1.8 million pages. The next NEH grant deadline is November. The way things typically work is the first time you submit a grant application there is likelihood that you will not be granted an award. The granting agency provides constructive feedback from the review panel. That would mean resubmitting an application which may have more chance of being funded. This could be a Sesquicentennial project that could help generate community funding. One question was how could Nevada leverage what the state's CHIs have already done with newspaper digitization if the state were to receive a big grant? How could the CHIs bring what they've done with grant funded "what we'll do" in to a harmonious whole?
- One or more CHIs do have some paper hardcopy for some of the microforms that have been destroyed. It might be possible to talk to NEH grant officer to get an exception to the microforms only requirement.

Next meeting: May 12-13, 2010 in Las Vegas. The second and third meetings include the chairs of the working groups.