

Nevada Statewide Digital Plan
Leadership Committee Meeting Summary

September 15, 2008

1. Attendees: Daphne De Leon Nevada State Library and Archives (NSLA); Sabrina Mercadante, City of Henderson; Steve Green, Western Folklife Center; Cindy Sharp, Nevada Department of Education; Jason Vaughan, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Donnelly Curtis, University of Nevada, Reno; Dana Hines, CLAN; Michelle Mazzanti, Henderson Public Library District; Lauren Stokes, Las Vegas Clark County Public Library District; Phyllis Sargent, NSLA, Jeanne Price, William S. Boyd School of Law; Cindy Southerland, The Historic Fourth Ward School; Michael Maher, Nevada Historical Society; Kim Vidoni, Nevada Department of Education; Karen Starr, NSLA; Liz Bishoff, BCR..

2. Welcome and Introduction: Daphne DeLeon welcomed the attendees and Karen Starr provided background on the project. They introduced Liz Bishoff from BCR (Denver, CO) who has been selected as the facilitator for the project. Liz has more than a decade of experience with digital collaboratives, initially as the founding executive director of the Colorado Digitization Program. She has worked with more and two dozen statewide digitization initiatives in their planning activities. Today Liz is continuing to work with statewide initiatives as well as in digital preservation planning and assessment. Tom Claerson joined the group in Tuesday, due to airline delays.

In addition to other materials in the handouts, a summary of the Leadership Committee participants' digital activities was included.

3. Meeting Objectives: The group identified the objectives of the meeting which included:

- Initiate the Planning Process
- Explore Collaborative Approaches
- Identify digital Standards and best practices
- Options within collaboration
- Identify a Shared vision / direction
- Gain understanding of Cultural Heritage Institution (CHI) assets in Nevada

4. Overview of Collaborative Digitization: Presentation was provided, which laid a foundation of benefits of collaboration across cultural heritage institutions. Different models of collaboratives, as well as keeps to success.

5. What are the needs that can be met through digitization of Nevada resources and how can a Nevada collaborative initiative address those needs? (C next to the item is what the committee felt could be address through collaboration)

- Discover related resources that are in different places. C
- Make ‘seeking’ more efficient for users; get to it online. C
- Provide variety of media – multimedia projects by students. C
- Authenticity
- Easy to find – Organized. C
- Access to rural communities. C
- Help preserve originals
- Provide provenance of Object
- Speed of delivery – quick turn-around C
- Self Service C
- Content is there when needed C
- Part of green effort C
- Tangible outcome of a donor C
- How can we respond to being able to use web resources C

6. What Market Segments do Nevada Cultural Heritage Institutions Address?

- The World
- Staff
- Citizens of local community
- Lawyers, Business, Special Interests
- Authors
- Government: state, city, county, legislatures, staff
- Students: K-12, 12-16, Post Graduate
- Teachers, parents
- Genealogists
- Faculty, researchers
- Local newspaper, media
- Other libraries, CHI
- Donors
- Documentary film producers
- Politicians
- Tourists
- Hobbyists
- Retirees
- Amateur / personal history
- Prospective student, resident

7. Collaborative Digital Market Segments—Nevada Digital Collaborative:

Discussed the market segmentation that was included in the RFP, which is the one developed by the Nevada Electronic Records Committee. The following modifications will be made. Students will be expanded to K-16. Within the hobbyist category, undergraduate and graduate students will be removed. Undergraduate students will be moved to the student category and graduate students will be moved to Scholars. Authors

will be added as an example of scholars. Donors/Funders will be added as a new category, as will staff.

- Visitor/General User
- Students: K – 16/Life long learner
- Hobbyists – Remove. Reference to undergrad, graduate
- Scholars – add grad student, add authors
- Donors / Funders
- Staff

8. Nevada Digital Environment

Strengths

- Collections spread across institutions
- Strong interest in content, history
- People who are considering CHI collaboration
- Plenty of opportunity to create collaboration
- Risk taking environment, it's the culture
- Have same content management infrastructure
- See a need for collaboration
- UNR – UNLV have experience and willingness to help , Individuals willing to do it

Institution Benefit to Collaboration / Collaborating

- Institutions content increasingly accessible
- Shared technical infrastructure, expertise
- Increased content for users
- One stop shopping for users
- Grants like collaboration
- Funders like collaboration
- Increased efficiencies
- Advocacy, PR
- Documentary – PBS downstream
- Pricing structures – increased revenue

Barriers

- Come from different organizations with different requirements
- Nevada's history of non-cooperation
- Different institution priorities
- Financial decline
 - Increased competition for grants
 - Economic downturn
 - 20% budget cuts last year
- Organizations have different technical infrastructures. Library places; openness of structures to the outside
- People to get the work done

- May not want to share content of collections – it will show that collections aren't cataloged or organized.

Threats

- Potential of losing credibility
- Not need any more
- Newspapers – Google: do they do them, or do we do them? Already have the experience of losing the user's association with the Society since NewspaperArchives.com has the Newspapers rather than the Society providing access to them.
- World is starved for content – we have it; other will figure it out how to get it and make it available.
- We will marginalize ourselves if we don't do it – Strength in numbers
- Lose out on funding

September 16, 2008

1. Attendees: Daphne De Leon Nevada State Library and Archives (NSLA); Sabrina Mercadante, City of Henderson; Steve Green, Western Folklife Center; Cindy Sharp, Nevada Department of Education; Jason Vaughan, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Donnelyn Curtis, University of Nevada, Reno; Dana Hines, CLAN; Michelle Mazzanti, Henderson Public Library District; Lauren Stokes, Las Vegas Clark County Public Library District; Phyllis Sargent, NSLA, Jeanne Price, William S. Boyd School of Law; Cindy Southerland, The Historic Fourth Ward School; Michael Maher, Nevada Historical Society; Kim Vidoni, Nevada Department of Education; Karen Starr, NSLA; Liz Bishoff, BCR and Tom Claerson.

1. Day 1 thoughts:

- Learned about perspective of museums on need for control of collections
- That we are making a distinction between collaboration and collaborative
- From the Museum point of view there is a technology gap that needs to be addressed. It's a barrier to getting people on board. What can we do to get them on board?
- Most projects are funded from operating budgets—this was a surprise.

2. Communications: BCR has established a variety of means of communications for the group. Early next week the project wiki will be available. Each of the Leadership committee members will be able to post to the wiki. The Leadership Committee will have monthly calls on the 3rd Thursday of the month at 11am PT.

Project Schedule: Stakeholder meeting is scheduled for December 11-12 in Las Vegas.

Community forums are tentatively scheduled for late January/early February, with a draft report by early March.

3. Survey: As part of the project a survey of the cultural heritage community will be conducted. Tom described the components of the survey, which include administrative data, information technology, collections, access, partnerships, rights management, etc.

Tom emphasized that due to the scope of the survey it is likely that an organization will require input from multiple departments in an organization. The committee recommended that the survey be sent to the director and that the cover message indicate that they may need to establish a team to respond. We will send an email with a link to the survey. Daphne indicated that she is meeting with the Library Directors in early October and she will tell them about the project and the survey. Cindy Sutherland indicated that she is reporting to the Museum Association Board and she will report the same.

Tom indicated that 20-25% return rate is good, but with good email addresses and a number of solicitations we could get as high as a 65% return. Collecting emails and posting to listservs will be critical to getting a high response rate.

Committee discussed whether they wanted to create a directory as a by-product of the survey. The Nevada Museum Association maintains a website listed the museums in Nevada. NSLA publishes an annual library directory that includes public, academic, special and school libraries. Daphne and Karen will develop a list of archives in the state. Daphne will work with the State Historic Records Advisory Board to identify the records centers in the state which hold archival and historical materials which fit with the digital initiative.

Group discussed the audience for the survey and where to go beyond traditional cultural heritage institutions and whether to include organizations like the Nevada Bureau of Mines and the Irrigation District as they have a lot of historic photos. After considerable discussion it was decided at this time to focus the project on Libraries, Archives, Museums and Historical Societies as we're focusing on organizations that have publicly accessible content as the common component. That in the future the project may be expanded to other organizations. Karen also noted that some of the non-CHI organizations had participated in the WESTPAS workshops and there was significant communication/vocabulary translation issues.

Subjects for Survey

Nevada History
Energy Resources
Water Resources
Western History
Tourism
Mining
Land Use
Entertainment Industry
Ranching
Art and Architecture
Music
Literature
Climate
Business
Local History
Religion
Gaming
Ethnicity
Politics
Transportation
Technology
Anthropology and Anthro
Ghost Towns
Geology

Nuclear Testing
Marriage and Divorce
Brothels
Extraterrestrials

Formats - Add

Maps (architect draw posters)
Manuscripts (letters)
3-dimensional
Art
Newspapers
Text—Architectural Drawings, Posters

Approaches—eliminate this question

Theme/Subject
Highlight of institution collection
Other

Who are Must-Have Organizations? Committee recommended that we must get survey responses from the following organizations.

UNR

UNLV

NSLA

NHS

Nevada Supreme Court Library

Washoe County Library System

Las Vegas-Clark County Library District

Northeastern Museum and Historical Society (also archive)

Clark County Museums

Boulder Museum

City of Henderson

Henderson District Public Libraries

White Pine County Museum (also archive)

CLAN—Dana indicated that the survey should be sent to her and she will see that all her members respond.

Desert Research Institute Library

Nevada State Museum

Railroad Museum

Western Folk Life Center

Churchill County Museum

Douglas County Historical Society

It was recommended that a question of the level of processing/cataloging be added to the survey.

4. Who's using what Best Practices? A quick survey of the group found that the majority of the attendees are using a variation of the Western States Dublin Core Best Practices. Folklife Center has developed their own in-house system based on Filemaker Pro; City of Henderson uses Opentext, but is currently testing the export of content to the Public library's CONTENTdm system. CLAN is using OCLC Western's recommended metadata for newspapers. Historical Society is using Past Perfect.

5. Do you want to do a statewide digital collaborative?

It was agreed that the group need to address this issue head on. Is it possible to do? Michael indicated that there is no technical infrastructure within state government to do it. Other comments included:

--State Library is going to have to take a larger role

--We need policies.

--Does there have to be a state infrastructure to make it happen?

--It can grow over several years—it doesn't have to happen in 1-2 years. Can 2 universities, Clark Co, CLAN do a demonstration project?

Group explored the benefits of a Statewide collaborative from a university, museum and archive. Indicated which of the benefits of a digital collaborative would benefit a university library, a museum and an archive.

Institution Benefit to Collaboration / Collaborating

- Institutions content increasingly accessible—University, Museum, Archive
- Shared technical infrastructure, expertise—Museum,
- Increased content for users—University, Museum, Archive
- One stop shopping for users—University, Museum
- Grants like collaboration--University
- Funders like collaboration
- Increased efficiencies
- Advocacy, PR—University, Museum,
- Documentary – PBS downstream
- Pricing structures – increased revenue

Discussed point of if you can see benefits, how can we overcome the barriers, particularly the barrier of lack of a culture of collaboration.

Barriers that need to be removed include:

--Getting buy-in from directors

--Consider a demonstrate collaboration with a collaborative that includes UNR, UNLV, museum and archives

--Demonstration project will something going quickly. This should include outsourcing content creation and possibly metadata creation. This would be a proof of concept grant.

Straw poll indicated that everyone agreed that moving forward on a statewide initiative was desirable.

6. LSTA Grant 2008-2009: Group discussed other components of a 2008-2009 grant:

- Create a Collection Policy
- Create a Website that links existing projects
- Adopt statewide Best practice/standards
- Create local partnerships that would build up to statewide.
- Leadership committee should continue, meeting 4 times a year
- Grants for projects
- Facilitator
- Fund CDM multi-site server if it doesn't already provide for statewide use.

Idea is that over a 5 year period the collaborative would grow. Start small and grow the collaborative.

7. Purpose/mission of Nevada Statewide Digital Initiative:

Increase access to the collections held by Nevada's CHI's through digital access to materials by residents of Nevada and scholars and researchers interested in Nevada's culture and history.

8. Stakeholders Meeting:

Liz reviewed the Open Space Technology methodology that will be used at the Stakeholder's meeting. People will convene in a large group circle, there will be no tables, just chairs. The process will result in the participants establishing the agenda and timeframe. Those that suggest topics will lead the discussions. The groups will develop the recommendations. Day 2 will largely focus on prioritizing and finalizing the document. Outcome should be goals and activities for the plan. It is a very participative process.

Key to the success is inviting the people and having the right environment for the meeting. The group discussed possible venues. Sabrina offered to investigate the Henderson Convention Center facilities. We will need one large meeting room and 4-5 small groups for concurrent sessions.

9. Wrap-up: Karen, Daphne and Liz thanked everyone for their active participation in the meeting and wished them well on their travels.