

Location:

Hosted by Liz Mengel at Johns Hopkins Macksey Room in the Brody Learning Commons
3400 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, 21218

Attendees:

Carolyn Allen, Sarah Beaubien, K. Matthew Dames, Mark Herring, Martha Hruska, Liz Mengel,
James Simon, Steve Sowards, Mark Stover, Tom Teper, Doug Way

Unable to Attend:

Sharon Farb, Elizabeth Kirk, Michael Levine-Clark, Diane Smith

Board Facilitator

Mark Sandler

Reveal Digital

Peggy Glahn, Jeff Moyer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Task Assignment 2

What can we learn from other open access projects 2

Marketing and Outreach Best Practices 3

 Review of Executive Committee Survey Results (facilitated by Mark Sandler) 3

Diversity & Dissent Digitization Fund Update 5

 Early reaction from market / frequently asked questions 5

 Funding Agreement Form 6

 Technology Partner Update 6

 Editorial Board Development 6

Financial Report 7

 New Commitments 7

 Cost Model Review 7

Meeting Support Material 8

Task Assignment

1. Jeff Moyer
 - a. revise wording on point 5 of Diversity & Dissent Agreement
 - b. distribute spreadsheets on models for Diversity & Dissent and the KKK project.
2. Mark Stover
 - a. Send WEST agreement (completed at the meeting!)
3. Mark Sandler
 - a. Send TCP agreement.
4. Peggy
 - a. Develop statement for the KKK Newspaper project affirming the benefits of digitizing and opening access to the material. Circulate to the Executive Committee for input.
5. Executive Committee
 - a. Look for opportunities for Reveal Digital to present to groups to which you belong. Propose us for agendas. Jeff and Peggy can participate by phone or in person, or Executive Committee members can do the presenting.
 - b. Submit agenda items for the ALA meeting of the Executive Committee. Meeting will be Sunday June 25, 8:30 – 10:30.

What can we learn from other open access projects

Four Executive Committee members provided informal presentations about open access initiatives they have been a part of or supported in the past. The goal of this section was to surface best practices Reveal Digital should consider incorporating to improve marketing and outreach efforts. Below are some of the key takeaways.

- Much of what Reveal Digital is doing is validated by the approach of other successful initiatives and should be continued. Transparency builds trust.
- A tier contribution model makes sense. Our five-year contribution model enables predictability for budgeting purposes.
- We must add new members to compensate for those that will drop off in the future. Continue to approach AUL's and heads of collections
- Input from potential users is crucial
- Find partners to help with technical aspects
- Value of collaboration

Marketing and Outreach Best Practices

Review of Executive Committee Survey Results (facilitated by Mark Sandler)

Mark asked the Executive Committee to complete a survey on outreach and marketing topics related to Reveal Digital. See addendum for detailed results. Below is a summary of the discussion spurred by each question.

Q1. Who are best people in libraries to talk to?

- Most common answer, subject specialist. Second most, collection officers.
- Challenging answer for Reveal Digital because there are many more subject specialists in ratio to Collection Officers.
- Committee members talked about the decision making process in their own institutions which varied from AUL's starting the process with input from subject librarians to subject librarians raising the opportunity to AULs. Different types of institutions have different approaches.

Q2. Why should libraries support Reveal Digital?

- Pretty even split between open access and curriculum enrichment. If it is open access, funding may be able to come from central funds rather than discipline funds.

Q3. Most important selling point?

- Content most important
- The people matter. Trust issue. Relationships are important.
- Will be interesting to see how the answer to this question changes over time. Content was the door opener.
- Board members influence others.

Q4. Most compelling argument

- Low cost / open access
- More explicitly compare the price of Reveal Digital content to similar collections published under traditional models

Q5. Which group is best served by the content?

- Political Activism was a surprising winner.
- Thinking of KKK. At this moment in time wide group looking at the antecedents of where we are today.

Q6. Should content strive for broad multi-disciplinary or narrow focus?

- Most went with shoot for broader. Subject specialists look for narrower, or else they have to build coalitions.

- Institutions that don't serve PhD programs think breadth is more important. Might not be true for larger institutions.
- We don't always know who is using it. With the interdisciplinary nature of things, you may buy something for women's studies that ends up being used by political science. What made Independent Voices interesting was pulling together things that would otherwise be difficult to pull together.
- The idea behind Investment fund was to focus on the narrow but be able to aggregate across a broader mass. The sum is more than the parts.

Q7. What is the benefit for those folks who are investing? How to acknowledge investment.

- Cash credits was the winner.
- Also, web site acknowledgment. Include branding logo. Print logo on download that shows user content is coming from their library.
- This stuff might be used in unexpected ways. Targeted at Women's Studies, but more uptake in political science. What might be helpful, collect those stories and start talking about how this collection is being used in ways other than the obvious. Multidisciplinary studies are not the hot new thing. They are the norm now.
- Sometimes a faculty person's research track goes permanently outside the area for which they were hired. There is an opportunity to talk about this content being used in ways never imagined. Keeps you from painting yourself into a box.
- Don't want to overestimate how effective liaisons are making faculty aware. Hundreds of resources are added and subtracted to collections. Outside the moment of need, alerting to new resources is just white noise.
- **Point of Need** is key phrase.
- The branding is helpful but I would put money into improving discovery. The discovery environment and some sort of recognition of how this is being made available is important.

Q8. Executive Committee Roles

- There was a draw between understanding user needs and library needs.
- With our system, library deans meet on a regular basis. There are two of us in the group that invested in Independent Voices. I made a strenuous effort to promote the project and tried to get on the agenda.
- Consortia directors tend not to want to push initiatives. Member help to promote an idea is very helpful in consortia purchases.
- For Reveal Digital people to be able to reference a board member or the board in general in reaching out can be very impactful.

Q9. Terrible advisory boards

- Most popular response was not getting a sense input has been acted upon.
- Everyone appreciates action items at the end of a meeting. Next steps. Otherwise it's just sound and fury.
- Meeting notes online are good to have for purposes of transparency. Also, if a member wasn't able to participate, they can read a summary. Meeting notes are also used to prep for the next meeting.

Q10. Other roles to consider for Executive Committee membership

- Faculty member was leading answer. Scholarly comm. Librarian did well too.
- Inviting faculty and grad students to present at meetings should be considered. Always the most interesting part of a meeting. They think things that are surprising.

Diversity & Dissent Digitization Fund Update

Early reaction from market / frequently asked questions

- Within a week of launch five or six libraries reached out immediately to say they wanted to contribute or wanted to set a time to talk. University of Rhode Island, Notre Dame, Oberlin College were a few of those.
- Consistent questions/concerns:
 1. Are we going to be charging a one-time fee for every project or will the investment fund cover every project? (answer: no).
 2. The concern emerging is that unlike Independent Voices where there is content people can use, there is so far nothing immediately tangible for people to show for their investment. They are seeing risk. Some say they cannot give money if they receive nothing immediately in return.
- Discussion
 - State institutions may have a problem using general funds, but may be able to use soft money that comes from foundations or fundraising.
 - Can we position as a membership organization?
 - Memberships are less of a problem than acquisitions. Don't have to prove I can't get a membership from someone else.
 - It is easier if we have a product or a physical entity.
 - May need to have more specific information including a financial plan, a delivery plan.
 - Should we adjust the name of Diversity & Dissent to emphasize the membership aspect?

Funding Agreement Form

- Purpose of the agreement is to document commitments and memorialize Reveal Digital's responsibilities.
- A subset of the Executive Committee has reviewed the draft. Opened up to full committee for comment. For your funding, here's what you committed to, and here's what you get. A subset of the committee has commented on drafts.
 - If it looks like a contract, it has to have legal review. If it looks like an MOU, it doesn't (this looks like a contract).
 - Anything that needs a signature needs to go through procurement.
 - What are benefits of having an agreement: A basis for renewals. If a librarian makes a commitment and moves on to another institution, we'd like to have something that memorializes the commitment within the institution.
 - If there is a commitment form in place, there is an ethical reason to continue. The other members are counting on the collective effort. Reveal Digital's agreement isn't binding. We aren't going to sue people if they back out.
- Item 5 – Wording is confusing Should explicitly state that the fund will not reimburse for travel and other costs related to participation on the Executive Committee, Editorial board or other working groups.
- There isn't much information about what Reveal Digital will deliver out of the fund.
- Need more information on the LYRISIS and Reveal Digital.

Technology Partner Update

We sent an RFP to surface and evaluate alternative hosting and preservation options. We received good feedback from multiple parties, but only one institution will be responding. We expect to get response by end of the month [Received in mid April. More to come shortly].

We also received strong interest from Jisc. However, they are not in a position to do this now, but want to continue conversation. They may be a mirror site in the UK. We will keep in touch with them.

Editorial Board Development

Sarah, Tom and Doug have agreed to work together to develop the following for the editorial board. Please let Jeff know if anyone else wants to work on developing the editorial board.

- board mandate
- makeup of the board with an eye toward getting the board
- establishing by the end of summer

Financial Report

New Commitments

- Newspaper of the 1920's Ku Klux Klan
 - KKK has the highest number of commitments. Seven on the report. MIT just came on for eight. Project will reach 10% funding.
 - Talking to BTAA about group investment
 - UCLA, Berkeley will be contributing. Should soon be at 20%.
 - Forecasting 58 libraries, \$335,000 in year one. Pretty aggressive, but we feel comfortable given our base of 110 funding libraries.
 - In addition to Peggy's outreach to Independent Voices funding libraries, we also have a group of three sales people who are splitting time between Reveal Digital and NA Publishing. Their focus is on non-current funders.
- Diversity & Dissent
 - Closed \$29,000 in commitments so far. Multiplied by five, we are over \$100k.
 - CDL was looking at a system-wide contribution, but they will not be able to do so this year.
 - UCLA, Berkeley and UCSD will be contributing.
 - BTAA is looking at a group contribution or separate commitments from libraries.
 - We are projecting the value of the fund to go up over time. As modeled, we anticipate having almost \$40,000 in first year, \$327,000 in year two, up to \$720,000 in year five to invest in digitization projects. That's a tremendous fund to invest. There are amazing things we can do collectively.

Cost Model Review

Jeff reviewed the cost models and assumptions for both the KKK Newspaper project and the Diversity & Dissent fund. Jeff will send the models to the entire Executive Committee following the meeting.

Discussion

- Getting in front of potential controversies. Do we have a written statement that would provide rationale for digitizing the KKK material in response to people who are concerned about hate speech? We need to state our goal to help create a society where hate is diminished; where reason, collegiality and civil discourse is encouraged. We should be pointing out the other marginalized voices that are now available in Independent Voices.
- From KKK cost model, Wisconsin Historical Society depends to some extent on royalties from publishers who use their material for digitization. Is that factored in? Response:

Because the KKK newspapers will be open access, WHS is very supportive. They will be compensated for scanning. In this case they have elected to forego any royalty.

- The cost categories used for the different projects appear to be inconsistent. The labels are different and the cost base seems to be different. For example, there are labels like Systems vs. Hosting. Sourcing vs. Rights, Outreach vs. Marketing. It is hard to measure transparency. Can we harmonize? Response: Yes, we will try to maintain consistency across projects where we can. There will be different cost categories for different projects. For example, there is a small bucket for royalties in Independent Voices, but that's not needed in other projects. There are is an amount set aside for digitization in Diversity & Dissent but we don't know what we will be digitizing yet.

Meeting Support Material

Below is the survey to which Executive Committee members responded and was discussed during the meeting.



Reveal Digital
Executive Committee