**BHL Annual Members’ Meeting**

**Business Meeting, AMNH**

**March 11, 2014**

**Action Items**

Martin and Tom will follow up with Event Network

All will make initial contacts with people at their institutions to gauge feasibility and interest in working with Event Network

On the next monthly Members’ call (April), we'll find interested parties for fundraising efforts and we'll try to find a time for interested people to get together.

Martin will work with the EC to outline some big topics of fundraising needs.  Then we can break down into different level packages (500, 1,000, 50,000).

Check in with Dave Opkins and Kathy on Dues received to date. Email all to confirm receipt.

Carolyn to send around grant spreadsheet with Monthly reminders.

All to begin sharing abstracts for potential grant proposals with the group before they are submitted.

Life & Literature: We need a report to publicize how the results of L&L have been incorporated into BHL, operations, priorities, and strategic plan. Need something we can point to and justify if we need another one.

Strategic Planning group to convene before end of May: Tom, Becky, Chris F, Tomoko, Jane, Connie, Susan, Chris M, John Mignault, Staff from AMNH research services librarian

Martin will share the operational objectives, basically operational from Secretariat perspective, for the group’s review.

From the Tech Meeting, we’ll provide what's required to implement technical tasks and priorities to the group for strategic planning and prioritization

Martin will contact Christine regarding hosting of the next meeting and roughly sketch out 2nd and 3rd week of March 2015 for next meeting.  Martin and Nancy will look into scheduling a day for smaller meetings before the Members’ meeting.

Marty to talk to Bianca about invited talk on BHL

The March Members’ call is canceled.

Attending

Nancy Gwinn, Tom Baione, Susan Fraser, Connie Rinaldo, Martin Kalfatovic, Judy Warnement, Eric Chin, Becky Morin, Jane Smith, Chris Mills, Diane Rielinger, Chris Freeland, William Ulate, Kelli Trei, Marty Schlabach, Doug Holland, Tomoko Steen, Carolyn Sheffield (recording)

**0915 - 0930: Approval of minutes from last meeting:**

Approved.

**0930 - 0945: Nancy reviewed and recorded votes taken electronically since previous meeting, as outlined in the agenda.**
No changes.

[**0945 - 1045**](http://tel.wikispaces.com/0945%2B-%2B1045)**: Review and vote on the revision to the by-laws; discussion of how to proceed with new MOU.**

The group reviewed the draft by-laws, identified some changes which have been incorporated into a revised version, and voted on and approved the revised by-laws. Excerpts from the discussion follow.

Nancy Gwinn provided an overview of the revisions to the BHL MOU and Bylaws that have been made with input from the Smithsonian Attorney. Based on the discussions with the attorney, Nancy presented some options on how the bylaws and MOU might be structured.

One option would be to have the Bylaws comprise the significant body that forms the principles outlined in the MOU. The MOU then might have a lighter document, one page, outlining the main principles, and what is expected in terms of participation. The bylaws would serve as governance mechanism for the Member level and Affiliate Level.

Another option would be to have a longer MOU document which BHL Members would need to craft over time.

This raised the question on what would be involved if the BHL Members continued to change it. Members have voted to suspend portions in the past.

If the MOU is good for 3-5 years, it would more firmly lock us into that. A last provision would need to be added that Members agree to the latest version of the bylaws as they are amended from time to time. In essence, it would require formally amending the bylaws and that would become part of the process.

Another question that arose was how BHL global would fit into this, because BHL-Australia for example has asked for a new MOU.

Martin clarified that the requested MOU would be between Smithsonian and Atlas of Living Australia for a different partnership and BHL might be just one of the activities that they participate in that Smithsonian MOU.

Singapore will participate at both the Central and Global level.

For global partners, we could present them the MOU and Bylaws.

Jane Smith: The simpler the better.  Is their consistency?  Are they compatible?

Nancy Gwinn: They are, if paying dues.  At this point, Global partners with the exception of Singapore are not paying dues.

Martin Kalfatovic: With Egypt, we're currently operating on the expiring EOL agreement, and Australia as well.

Nancy Gwinn: I agree that they all need to be compatible; they need to agree to principles and what we're trying to achieve.

Martin Kalfatovic: The MOU and Bylaws no longer links into EOL. EOL still maintains a relationship, a unique status between Affiliate and Member. EOL also has relationship with CONABIO, but we would probably want a separate agreement.

Nancy: So we could have a single MOU with a checkbox - Member or Affiliate.  Global nodes would be one of the two.

If they chose not to do that, then they would be governed by a non-binding agreement.

Organizations would also fall into this.  GBIF or IA.

Jane: What we're proposing is that this is MOU is closer to a contract.

Martin: Yes, and more contractual things may happen depending on the two lawyers talking from each parties signing the MOU.

Chris Freeland: Under organizations, what about ALA and EOL?

Nancy Gwinn: By virtue of the bylaws, EOL is already a member.  They have a special status because of our history.

Martin: ALA is part via BHL-Aust.  But they could join as a separate member.

In article 5 section 1, EOL has a representative in BHL

Connie (?): Will we charge fees for services we do for people who are not paying dues? For example, if an Affiliate wants to contribute a lot of material and it will cost us, should we charge?

It tends to bring an awareness of the value, and cost to BHL, of those services that we provide. It also illustrates what the Dues provide for Members. (This discussion was tabled for later.)

Martin: I propose we get a draft MOU from the SI General Counsel.  After we approve the Bylaws, we can have those reviewed and they can draft the MOU and if it looks to us like it will work, we can make any tweaks and use it.

All would have a chance to review and share with their own institutions before that final version is approved.

Nancy: For the Bylaws, we have tried to make them as general as possible.  We can update and change appendices without going through whole bylaws revision.  So some stuff has been moved to the appendices.

One change that has been made is that the Article VII, Section I now allows for an immediate past chair.

The Nominating Committee provides for an at-large member to be on there.  The immediate past chair would also be on Nominating Committee

Marty (?): The current Membership Process Appendix needs to be amended to line up with bylaws.

The Membership Committee is one of ad hoc committees.

A discussion followed of the advantages of keeping the by-laws simple and the more fluid aspects of the principles as appendices, as revising appendices is generally easier. Revising by-laws usually involves getting some legal advice.

Nancy: In working with the Advisory Board at the Smithsonian, the advice received was to keep the by-laws simple, but that amendments can change much easier.

Bylaws and standing rules have a lot of stuff like this

The Appendices will explain more about how we operate, how the Members Council does its work.

Marty (?): Not sure that the distinction is significant to me. For by-laws and appendices, it looks like a similar process.

Nancy: We would never amend bylaws unless present and voting at Annual Meeting

Nancy then led a discussion of all Articles in the By-laws to identify changes and come to a vote. All changes from that discussion have been incorporated into a revised version of the by-laws.

Based on those changes, the group voted and approved the by-laws.

**Discussion and Approval of the Dues Operating Budget**

Martin Kalfatovic provided an overview of the overall Operating Budget including Smithsonian and MOBOT subventions and grants, and then discussed the BHL Dues and Donations budgets in more detail.

**Donations:** Includes those funds received through the Donate Button on the website. These are generally applied to scanning.

Program Director Contingency fund -- Specified donation for SI BHL.

**Dues**

Martin walked through the current Dues budget including Secretariat costs, Technical costs, pan-BHL scanning, Members travel and Meeting costs, outreach expenses, and contingency and indirect costs.

**Grants**

Miscellaneous grants from SIL. This year, includes a Smithsonian Women’s Committee grant to work with Jiri Frank on use of the Biodiversity Exhibitions platform.

MOBOT grants – Art of Life, Purposeful Gaming. Also Digging Into Data.

Nancy: We need to track the grant proposing process and discussion with members more closely.

Note: Chris noted an error on Smithsonian Storage Cluster costs – the overall budget for all funds should have been $14,000 instead of $15,000. Corrected 3.18.14 CS

**Development/Advancement Review and discussion**

**Donations** – We’ve seen an increase as a result of our Appeals efforts and are aiming for quarterly appeals.

**Event Network** – Martin and Tom have been in discussions with Event Network for things like museum cards, co-branded BHL products that could be sold in museum shops.

Funds generated would come back to BHL for scanning.

Participation would be Opt-in for BHL institutions.

Event Network would present suggestions, BHL would approve the products that we’d like to sell and the funds would come back to Central BHL.

Where's the overhead?

If everyone opts out, it can go into a circular file.

Members could ask locally.  Will Member institutions consider?

Also need to talk with Event Network.  Could we send out to other shops?

Nominal kickback to BHL, split between shop and BHL, and Event Network.

Bookstores – for example, last year $1,500.

Is visibility worth it in and of itself?  Beyond the nominal kickback?

We would write the blurb on the back of the products.

Commercial licensing -- we would authorize commercial use for the person that has that use.

Would co-branding be within individual shops? It’s still unclear.  Triple branding - Notecard from Cal Acad image from HUH courtesy of BHL

Martin and Tom to follow up with Event Network.

All to make initial contacts with people at their institutions.

**Development and Fundraising**

Tom had discussion late last year about assisting with fundraising. In discussing the plan a bit further, the advice was to look at how group as whole has advantage over individual institutions looking for funding. How we could approach different kinds of funding sources.

Martin has talked with Library and Corporate Giving staff at Smithsonian.  One page concept for an ask.

Liz from AMNH Advancement – Look at how we can differentiate ourselves.

As a Consortium, independent of individual programs, funds for coordinating.

Look for funders interested in the consortium as whole, larger than the sum of its parts. Corporate funders for example might be interested in being affiliated with the larger organization.

MK - we have regular fundraising appeals for BHL. Shared with Tom the template documents. If the group as whole wants to send out from their own institution, welcome to. If mutually agreed upon, we can all send out.

NG - you wouldn't want to send out to AMNH membership at large. Who would you send it to?

From Central BHL, we send to community list who has been using BHL and sometimes we send things out generally. We have also sent to wider SI lists.

Liz – I was thinking of targeted solicitations, more than appeal. Some of the foundations that we know might not be interested in funding something at AMNH but would with larger organization.

Would be great to set up a discussion with Liz and Tina Murracco.

\*\*Next monthly call we'll find interested parties and we'll try to find a time for interested people to get together.

\*\*MK in EC, outline big topics of fundraising needs.  Then we can break down into different level packages (500, 1,000, 50,000)

For example, Data Analyst position.  Document what that means.  BHL needs this position, we could raise, then we distribute to the institution that can implement, and we have to be able to report outcomes.

\*\*Cancel Members Call

\*\*Check in with SIL Finance on dues received to date

\*\*Email all to confirm receipt

**Strategic Plan**

Nancy led a discussion of some assumptions for building the strategic plan. These can provide a way of looking at how we can move forward with progress and create a better basis for fundraising. Also came out of discussions from BHL Day and what Nancy has seen as missing.

Assumptions --

Bullet 1 -- We want to plan for 3 years with priorities.

Bullet 2 -- Identify the strength of database. We need to find a way to do this.  And finding other content. We don't really know what we need. We've analyzed the collection and matched to Harvard and SI collection and developed some priorities for scanning or ingestion. How do we visualize what gaps are?

We could compare to Hathi Trust.

Analyzing what we have and what the needs are.

After some analysis, revisit some stuff that rounds out collection.

Developing a humanities center at NYBG for example.

Do we branch out before we know if we have the core?

Analysis would also allow us to focus where we might have funding opportunities

Corpus of global nodes.  Have they already been digitized?

And analysis of what is out there

Another assumption, we need funding for scanning or ingest to increase content.

Collections Plan -- should we be focusing on attention on core items or on opportunity?

Bullet 3 Technical Plan

Bullet 4 More functionality

Bullet 5 - EOL discussions.  One question that has come up is why is the biodiversity community not banding together?  Astrophysicists get together and decide every year. More competitive in the biodiversity community.

Introducing other themes, topics beyond biodiversity -- history of science.

Chris F: Hathi Trust, this is a glaring omission in our assumptions.

Eric: let’s be careful not to lose the BHL branding.

Jane: it really depends on researchers or users.  There are multiple uses, but what is the core?

Becky: At Life & Lit.  we received input from people that wanted us to branch out more.  At that time, we had a strength and stuck with it, but now not as much.

Judy - history of science, not divergent.

Institutions will have a challenge in justifying participation in both BHL and Hathi Trust. Key with Hathi Trust, we need to decide what we want that relationship to be.

The price figure -- Making analysis part of our approach

Value – what is added to BHL product?

Collections within BHL, we can define a scope. Other groups might enrich areas where we do want to develop additional tools

NG - other organizations, like GBIF, CBOL

We need better communication about funding proposals. EOL has a very nice spreadsheet:  Where submitted, when, what happened

We have one, but it's not as visible. Nor do we report as regularly.

Better codified list or spreadsheet

Carolyn offered to send the grant-tracking sheet that we use with the monthly reminders.

William: We work from the list of priorities. We took topics from the Projects & Initiatives that weren't funded and lined up with available grants out there. That's how we got the most recent projects funded. We included digitizing in project, so benefits other BHL institutions as well.

All proposals need to have Technical Director approval.

A review process prior to submission of a grant was also proposed. Would be similar to getting institutional approval before submitting a grant. The goal would be to prevent duplication, internal competition, and improve communication including the group’s input on priorities.

So we all need to work on getting an abstract or something that Members can look at and discuss before it goes in. And to prevent dueling applications. Has come up once -- Global Names extension . Abstract presented to group and TAG group

We need to reinforce this and regularize the process.

To facilitate that, on monthly calls, technical grants, if people did a written summary ahead of time.  It's a complicated discussion for a call

**Life & Literature**

There has never really been a conclusion of what we learned there.

Maybe we need to have another – Nancy mentioned this to a funder.  The response was essentially that nothing came out of first one

Needs to be documented in terms of conclusion, discussion. Say why, what we found useful, why we would need another one.  Publicize how we have used the results or integrated them into strategic plan.

Outcomes -- Final report.  On wiki.  Also, Bianca led exercise of all recommendations of all focus groups, all of those recommendations were incorporated into P&I

Then exercise and put into priorities list.  Look at Life & Literature.  A lot of projects from there.

William -- Tools and services.  Year ago.  Coming from that list.  We continue to review.

Chris F – There is a gap in what we've done and the funder seeing what we've done.  Bring it up into some kind of results to publicize.  3years later, what are the outcomes?

**Strategic Plan**

How do we want to work on finalizing the strategic plan? We could call a special meeting and have a retreat to do this.

A Strategic Planning group could form and do it.

Or groups for each goal could form and come back at a specified time.

Goal for completion = End of Summer.

It was decided that one Small Group will work on finalizing the plan. The Strategic Planning group should be comprised of a new member, a convener, and a diversity of institutions, maybe a BHL-Staffer, someone in trenches, and someone Technical?  For example, Becky, Connie, Diana Shih, Matt Person, 7 or 8 altogether.

Technical - could be more for details

BM - agree technical might be jumping the gun

NG  - what functions that we might be missing, is a general discussion.

Where is likely to be in five years?  Who are our strategic partners?

Where we want to be and where we want to go?

**The Strategic Planning Group:**

Tom, Becky, Chris F, Tomoko, Jane, Connie, Susan, Chris M, John Mignault, Staff from AMNH research services librarian

Chris F - what is the process?

High level group, how to do it.

Groups of people, focused on smaller goals

High level document that garners reaction. Filling the goal buckets.

What if each of us went to our groups and came up with input from them on high level goals and then the group comes together to prioritize?

How do we turn this into a more inspirational, externally facing thing?

Five goals that we operate on. Can we frame in a different way to make more inspirational? Actions on how we do that?

Connie - we also need to use the P& I list,

What in that document, the staff up document, answers these questions?  How we make these more individual goals a broader BHL goal?

NG: the group will take all these pieces and work these into objectives

In some cases, we're pretty much 98% of the way

We may need another subgroup, collections or technical or something

How then do we go to next step of coming to objectives under each goal?

Plan with a clear brand and should be communicable.

We can also set up a structure for frequent review.

Tasks and activities

We need to take a look, a SWAT analysis might be too formal, but that kind of look.

**Really aspirational and forward thinking.**

Big picture of what we're trying to achieve, besides a big database of content.

How do we improve research methodology?

What is it we're really trying to achieve?

MK will share Operational objectives -- basically operational from Secretariat perspective.

The Strategic Planning Group will meet before the end of May.

**Technical Meeting**

The next BHL Technical Meeting will be April 1 – 4 in St. Louis and will include the Tech Team, TAG, and others in technical development.

What does this group feel is needed in terms of technical priorities?

* Full text searching
* Primary source material – How to handle the variety presented by primary source documents, e.g., bound into albums. Sideways & Upside down, a way to rotate them
* Article level metadata from Macaw

Chris F: Is there a current road map for technology development?

Martin: Yes

* OCR improvement.
Right now OCR is done in IA and we don't have conrol over version or software. How to handle a better OCR? Right now one version, and one text. One way might be to have different version. Or generate our own or gaming to improve it.

Martin presented the list of existing technical priorities (not including those which have been completed):

1. Full text searching
2. Semantic tools to computational trait elements
3. Improve filtering of taxon terms / co-occurrence
4. Allow common name searching
5. Add GIS searching
6. Multi-lingual access
7. Mobile
8. Support user created collections
9. Improve search
10. Improve Bandwidth
11. Linkouts to other systems
12. Move CiteBankt o BHL
13. Namefinding improvements
14. Citation reconciliation functionality
15. Enbale article level access
16. OAI interface article info
17. Move article level up as a priority, ingest
18. Re-examine use of DOIs, do we want to continue CrossRef? Other providers?  Maybe something more scalable

Becky -- when was last time API was looked at?  MK - we did right before DLF presentation.  WU updated documentation.  EOL research sprint, they also used that.  there are some things that might be better explained still

1. Improve automated pagination using algorithmic methods (CF - you'd have to partner with)
2. We need to outline global issues, if technical, how to solve; if political how to solve. China for example has challenges with scanning that set it apart.

Marty: What about other open access journals?

Martin: It’s a multi-part answer. First, political. Whether we want to do those kinds of things.  Second, there is data mapping that would need to be done.  Third is the technical process.

Marty - ingesting other global content.  Like from China, that are digitizing content and ingesting -- not an issue of technology.  If IA is not the technology issue but otherwise it would be a tech issue on how to deliver access.  Brazil is a combo of Macaw ingest and article linking. ZooKeys and SciElo for example.

Not a question of principle, only having access to metadata.

The question is complicated - TDWG liked those things because they're familiar.  But also quite concerned with BHL just becoming a link out.  We need to carefully curate what we link out to.

We also still have the option of stepping back.

One thing that’s come up in the Collections Calls that we’ll need to consider moving forward is do you rescan something that you have a link out to?

Not a tech question yet because some things still need to be decided in collections.

We're not harvesting their names, and if we continue, is that something we want to try to do?

If you're linking to just nothing, TDWG is not interested.

We want to make sure we’re creating a viable model.  Computational and actionable content.

For the Tech Meeting, we’ll also be discussing the process and next steps as we’re shutting down the MBL cluster and moving the process to SI. This will eventually provide a stable platform for the content. We can then add other types of control over that.

Doug: Another technical function to add to the list would be to provide the ability from the portal to filter to only things tagged as illustrations. Being able to filter on those page-level illustrations. We’ve done the pagination for many of these already.

Code for BHL is modularized appropriately

Fall back system, etc

Transportable

Is resilient an issue that can be discussed?

Outages in past few months

Has the technical group had discussions around what the issues are around resiliency and has there been a discussion about what can be down about those?

Diane – Another item for the list would be providing the ability for BHL Members to ingest metadata records into their own catalog records.

MK: Suz Pilsk is looking at this for Summons at SIL. Suz will document needs requirements and work with Mike etc. What we didn't want to do is have Mike delving into this too deeply. Once Suz has the requirements, we can pull in Mike.

Bill Carny -- Becky will get in touch with Suz

Are we asking Tech Group to develop priorities?  Asking them what it would take to do these?

Martin – the list is a mix of specific tasks and high level things. Actions and timelines and resource needs to present to this meeting. Strategic thing would be "better OCR' but that's a much more complex thing.

From the Tech Meeting, we’ll provide what's required to implement technical tasks and priorities to the group for strategic planning and prioritization

In essence, we are now working with three kinds of content:

* Our own scanned content
* Other scanned content that is in IA
* And then we have content that we only have metadata

First two are treated the same

Ingested, we can't write back, those name files don't go back to IA.

Linked out stuff, we don't hold the content.

**Members’ Meeting 2015**

We have logistics to consider for our growing group. Roughly 25 people in first day

Finding a room of suitable size, Space requirements. Also cost requirements for a growing group.

Structure - do we want a different kind of structure?  Reporting on first day?  Followed by the business meeting?

If we have a growing affiliations program, will they continue to attend or do we want a separate meeting for affiliates?

Does Day 1 become more of a mini conference?

What if held around existing meetings, e.g., CBHL or TDWG?

That meeting in conjunction around that?

Becky - a lot of value of having contact with Affiliates.  Also a better chance of turning into Members.  Also, if we are all traveling we might as well get in two days.

Inviting the other people out.   Also inviting other people out from other locally interested libraries.  It could be organized like a Life & Lit Lite.  It would be a great marketing tool.

Judy -- if from Cambridge for example, we could invite other institutions in the area.

If in San Francisco, we could invite UCSF.

How would we cover costs of a larger group?

Registration fees, Volunteers might be options.

Have the first day as more of an Affiliates, Members, and Potentials.

Tap 3 or 4 members

We wouldn’t have to provide lunch

For 2015, Christine offered to host in Chicago. In the past, have we had some hesitancy of having Affiliates as hosts? One advantage is that it could be seen as leverage for membership.

Other places Annual Meeting has been held:

NY - 3 times for Members. Woods Hole, Harvard a couple of times

Places we haven’t yet met:

Ithaka, San Francisco, London, Singapore.  Not DC in awhile.  St Louis?

2015 – Chicago - Approved.  Offer to set up meetings with Administrators a day ahead.

2016 – Singapore --  Could be a Members and Global Meeting.

Eric: It would be great to convene around where we have a strong collection.

BHL Day idea -- Great Idea

One agenda item:  Budget - carryover.  Also possible that we could propose budget in January that would be place until we vote on in the March.

We'll do a doodle poll a little further out from now.  To see if people already have known commitments.

We usually meet the second week of March.

Martin will roughly sketch out 2nd and 3rd week of March 2015.

**Final Action items and last comments**

Presentations – Marty shared that he was invited to give a talk and will probably be highlighting Purposeful Gaming.  Martin mentioned that Bianca was also invited by CBHL for Collections things. Marty will talk to Bianca and coordinate topics.

The group elected Susan Fraser as BHL’s Long Award representative to CBHL

No Members call for March.