

NORTHWEST DIGITAL COLLECTIONS

A REPORT FROM THE NORTHWEST
DIGITAL COLLECTIONS SUMMIT
SALEM, OR – MARCH 20, 2015

JULY 6, 2015

PREPARED FOR:
OREGON STATE LIBRARY
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
250 WINTER ST. NE
SALEM, OREGON 97301-3950

PREPARED BY:
DANIELLE CUNNIFF PLUMER, PH.D., M.S.I.S.
DCPLUMER ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
4500 WILLIAMS DR., SUITE 212-414
GEORGETOWN, TX 78633
WWW.DCPLUMER.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	4
BACKGROUND	4
MODELS FOR COLLABORATION	5
DIGITAL PUBLIC LIBRARY OF AMERICA.....	5
LOCAL & REGIONAL PROJECTS.....	6
DISCUSSION SESSIONS	7
OUTREACH & COMMUNICATION	7
LEADERSHIP & COLLABORATION	7
TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES & NEEDS	8
DIGITIZATION PRIORITIES.....	9
FUNDING SOURCES & NEEDS	9
PROVIDING CONTENT AND SERVICES	10
STANDARDS & BEST PRACTICES	11
CONCLUSIONS	12
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS	12
NEXT STEPS.....	13
APPENDICES	14
APPENDIX 1: PLANNING PROCESS	15
APPENDIX 2. SUMMIT INVITATION	20
APPENDIX 3. SUMMIT AGENDA	21
APPENDIX 4. SUMMIT DISCUSSION TABLE TOPICS & CHARGES.....	22
APPENDIX 5. SUMMIT DISCUSSION PROCEDURES.....	23
APPENDIX 6. PARTICIPANT RESOURCES & RELATED MATERIAL.....	24
APPENDIX 7. SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS.....	25
APPENDIX 8. RESPONSES TO SUMMIT RECOMMENDATIONS	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2015, the Oregon and Washington State Libraries jointly hosted a regional summit to discuss digitization and digital projects. They were assisted in the planning by an informal committee whose role included selecting summit invitees and determining an agenda for the event. A total of forty-nine participants were present for the summit on March 20, 2015, which was held at the Oregon State Library in Salem, Oregon.

Discussions at the summit centered on seven topics:

- Outreach & Communication
- Leadership & Collaboration
- Training Opportunities & Needs
- Digitization Priorities
- Funding Sources & Needs
- Infrastructure
- Standards & Best Practices

In addition, participants heard presentations on the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) and other collaborative projects, and discussion of future participation in DPLA was encouraged throughout the day.

The final recommendations from the summit, based on discussions held throughout the day, include:

1. Host a summit of funding agencies to work toward adoption of shared standards for digitization and metadata.
2. Explore support for a shared regional digital content system.
3. Support existing local and regional collaborative digitization projects, as well as existing statewide newspaper digitization programs in both Washington and Oregon.
4. Develop various written materials (toolkits, outreach materials, etc.) focused on broad community participation and establish a shared email list for distribution of materials and project updates.
5. Encourage institutions in Washington and Oregon to form one or more initial collaborative project(s) focused on eventual participation in the DPLA.
6. Support the option of participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance's Content Creation & Dissemination (CCD) Program for OCA members.

Next actions will include identification of individuals and institutions willing to support continued conversation about collaborative digitization and digital projects. In particular, a general advisory group should be formed, possibly including members of the summit planning committee, as well as groups to discuss training opportunities and needs and to discuss the ways in which funders of digital projects can work together to promote common digitization and metadata standards. A second regional meeting in spring or summer 2016 would then allow interested parties to continue the conversations begun at the 2015 Summit and to define a common vision for collaborative digital projects in the Pacific Northwest.

INTRODUCTION

On March 20, 2015, the Oregon and Washington State Libraries co-hosted a summit of nearly 50 library, archives, and museum professionals representing a variety of institutions and tribal communities in both states to discuss institutional needs and possible regional collaboration in digital projects. The one-day meeting, held at the Oregon State Library in Salem, Oregon, featured presentations by a collaborative projects at local, state, regional, and national levels and allowed participants to discuss topics ranging from leadership and funding of collaborative projects to metadata standards and shared infrastructure for digital projects. This report will provide background about the summit and summarize the discussions. It is not intended to be a final product of the summit or of the discussions leading to it but only another opportunity for diverse stakeholders and audience members to provide input into the future of digital collections efforts in the Northwest United States.

BACKGROUND

In 2013, the Oregon State Library commissioned an environmental scan of Oregon digital collections, including a review of existing digital projects in the state, discussions with key stakeholders, and identification of models for statewide collaboration, including information about governance, best practices, and funding models. The environmental scan was developed by Danielle Cunniff Plumer, Ph.D., a consultant specializing in collaborative cultural heritage digitization. Dr. Plumer also issued a series of recommendations for further action, which were presented to the Oregon Library Services and Technology Act Advisory Council in September 2013 and at the Oregon Library Association annual meeting in April 2014. The environmental scan and recommendations are available at <http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/Pages/projects/digicollections/index.aspx>.

At the Oregon Library Association meeting, attendees asked for additional ways to stay involved in the development of a digital collections plan for Oregon. One approach was proposed in the Oregon's Digital Collections report:

Establish an annual meeting of Oregon digital projects representatives

The Oregon State Library should invite institutions in the state with strong digital projects to work together. One way to do this is to support an annual meeting, perhaps held in conjunction with the Oregon Library Association or Oregon Museums Association annual meeting. The Oregon State Library should work with the Oregon Heritage Commission to explore ideas for collaboration in this area.

The Oregon Historical Society took the lead in beginning discussions on planning the first digital collections meeting. Geoff Wexler of OHS and OHS Library Advisory Council contacted the Oregon Heritage Commission and Oregon State Library to discuss the logistics of holding such an event. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and the Orbis Cascade Alliance were also contacted for their thoughts, and the Oregon State Library agreed to provide support for the meeting.

As the Oregon Historical Society and its partners began discussing the logistics of a summit, however, they recognized that many models of collaboration were regional in nature. In particular, the Northwest Digital Archives program of the Orbis Cascade Alliance was felt to be a possible model and foundation for future collaborative work. This program, which includes forty-one members from six states, provides enhanced access to thousands of archival and manuscript collections. In addition, the planning committee felt that the summit would be a good opportunity to discuss regional participation in the Digital Public Library of

America (DPLA), perhaps using a model similar to that of the Mountain West Digital Library, with a membership of over 180 institutions across six states.

An agreement between the Oregon and Washington State Libraries allowed the planning of a regional summit to begin. The final planning committee consisted of:

Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Evan Robb, Washington State Library
Geoff Wexler, Oregon Historical Society
Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission
Karen Estlund, University of Oregon
Ann Lally, University of Washington

Danielle Cunniff Plumer was hired to serve as facilitator of the meeting and to help with meeting planning and event logistics. Additional key partners were consulted to identify possible dates for the meeting and attendees.

MODELS FOR COLLABORATION

The primary desired outcome for the meeting, as identified by members of the planning committee, was the creation of a prioritized list of the top issues regarding digitization and digital content that could be addressed through statewide (or perhaps region-wide) actions. In addition, the committee wanted to provide participants with information about the DPLA in order to determine whether participation would be an appropriate goal for the region at the present time.

The Summit began with reports from collaborative projects to identify possible models and challenges that might be encountered in the development of a regional digital program. For participants who were not familiar with some of these programs, this provided an opportunity to learn about existing opportunities to collaborate and possible future partnerships. Many participants requested that additional information about the projects be shared so that they could take information back to their institutions.

DIGITAL PUBLIC LIBRARY OF AMERICA

Emily Gore, Director for Content at the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA), joined the summit by teleconference to discuss what DPLA provides and how it collects content from across the nation. The three essential functions of DPLA are to serve as a portal for discovery of collections of items contributed from its partners across the United States, to serve as a platform for interacting with those items for research and transformative uses, and to be an advocate for public access to cultural heritage collections. The DPLA portal currently provides access to over ten million items.

Emily discussed the DPLA hubs framework. There are two basic types of hubs: 1) content hubs, which provide access to items from their own collections, and 2) service hubs, which provide services to other institutions and aggregate the metadata records from multiple institutions to be included in DPLA. The list of all DPLA hubs is available at <http://dp.la/info/hubs/>. There are currently no service hubs providing access to collections from institutions in Oregon and Washington. While content hubs, which have a one-to-one relationship with DPLA, will continue to be limited to institutions with large and significant collections of digitized items, DPLA intends to add more service hubs over time to improve the ability of smaller institutions to participate.

Both service and content hubs contribute metadata describing items in their collections to DPLA. DPLA does not host the digital content. The metadata must conform to certain rules, which are described in the DPLA Metadata Application Profile, available at <http://dp.la/info/developers/map/>. Items must have titles, and other elements of descriptive metadata are desirable. For all of its hubs, DPLA requires that the metadata about items be licensed under a CC0 license, which essentially states that institutions do not place any restrictions on how the metadata is used. Note that this does not affect any copyright in or licenses placed on the actual digital objects, which DPLA does not collect.

DPLA is engaged in many areas of research. One current topic of work is the “Getting it Right on Rights” project, funded by a Knight News Challenge grant from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, that will create a standardized rights vocabulary that institutions can use to describe the copyright and permissions status of items in their collections. DPLA hopes that this will make it easier for users understand whether and how items can be accessed and re-used. DPLA is also actively working with the K-16 community to understand the needs of teachers and students. The DPLA Digital Curation Program works with library schools, including the School of Information at the University of Washington, to create exhibitions, listed at <http://dp.la/exhibitions>. These exhibitions tell stories focused on particular audiences using objects contributed by DPLA hubs and other partners.

Shortly after the meeting, the “Hydra-in-a-Box” project was announced by DPLA, Stanford, and DuraSpace (<http://dp.la/info/2015/04/15/far-reaching-hydra-in-a-box-joint-initiative-funded-by-impl/>). This project will develop a toolkit for using the Hydra open-source repository system, including features that improve institutional capability to share metadata about items with DPLA and similar efforts. Hydra is currently used by the University of Oregon Libraries and Oregon State University Libraries & Press for Oregon Digital.

LOCAL & REGIONAL PROJECTS

Representatives of collaborative projects in Oregon and Washington presented on the projects listed here. A more comprehensive list of digital collections in the Pacific Northwest is available at <http://www.washingtonruralheritage.org/cdm/resources>, maintained by staff at the Washington State Library.

- Ann Lally, University of Washington
 - University of Washington Digital Collections (<https://content.lib.washington.edu>)
 - King County Collects (<http://content.lib.washington.edu/impls/kccollects/>)
- Karen Estlund, University of Oregon
 - Oregon Digital (<http://oregondigital.org/catalog/>)
 - Historic Oregon Newspapers (<http://oregonnews.uoregon.edu>)
- Mark Dahl, Lewis and Clark College, for the Orbis Cascade Alliance
 - Content Creation and Dissemination (<https://www.orbiscascade.org/ccd>)
- Jodi Allison-Bunnell, Orbis Cascade Alliance
 - Northwest Digital Archives/Archives West (<http://nwda.orbiscascade.org>)
- Eva Guggemos, Pacific University
 - Washington County Heritage Online (<http://washingtoncountyheritage.org/>)
- Mary Jane Cedar Face, Southern Oregon University
 - Southern Oregon Digital Archives (<http://soda.sou.edu/>)
 - Southern Oregon University Digital Collections (<http://digital.hanlib.sou.edu/cdm/>)
- Evan Robb, Washington State Library
 - Washington Rural Heritage (<http://www.washingtonruralheritage.org>)

DISCUSSION SESSIONS

The afternoon was spent discussing specific topics. Each discussion group topic was scheduled twice, and participants were asked to join two different discussion groups in the course of the afternoon. Discussion groups were moderated by a member of the planning committee or another experienced facilitator.

OUTREACH & COMMUNICATION

Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify methods/best practices to keep individuals/organizations informed about effort, funding opportunities, training opportunities, best practices, etc.
- Identify methods to increase visibility of digital collections to the broader community

The outreach & communication discussion groups made the point that the responsibility for outreach and communication efforts will generally fall on individuals, and sometimes institutions. Oregon/Washington efforts should involve recruitment of a group of “ambassadors,” along the lines of the Digital Public Library of America’s Community Reps program, who will be given access to resources to share with both institutions and the public.

The groups also recommended the formation of a multi-silo advisory group, who would be asked to:

- Create a public packet to be used in outreach. This might include a short introductory PowerPoint deck; a brochure, bookmark, or similar products suitable for printing; and a one-page summary of digital projects in Oregon and Washington, for now.
- Convene a social media task force to find ways to use social media effectively, including cross-linking to other projects.
- Identify opportunities for collaborative crowdsourcing. Collaborative correction of text from digitized newspapers, along the lines of the Australian Trove program (<http://trove.nla.gov.au>), might be one effort.
- Launch an awards program, perhaps in partnership with library and museum associations

The groups felt that the key to successful outreach is working with members of the target audience(s) to create useful and appealing products, avoiding jargon in the marketing materials as much as possible. At least initially, the target audience(s) include members of the museum, library, and archives communities along with researchers, educators, and students.

LEADERSHIP & COLLABORATION

Mary Mara, City University of Seattle, Seattle, WA, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify scope of effort - local, statewide, regional - and how scope affects possible collaborations.
- Identify responsibilities of steering committee or other group tasked with coordinating effort

The leadership & collaboration discussion groups made the point that identification of goals and objectives for collaborative efforts must occur before a steering committee or other governing body can be tasked with oversight. The most frequently proposed goal was development of one or more shared portals or platforms for digital content, particularly to assist organizations that currently have access to no method to share items from their collections or which are using aging or ineffective applications for online publication of their collections, with strong support for both multiple platforms at a variety of levels (regional, statewide, and local). A secondary effort would be collecting information about digital objects (metadata) to be shared on the national Digital Public Library of America platform.

The responsibilities for a steering committee would include setting standards for both metadata and digital objects, developing a strategic plan for collaborative activities, promoting the effort through outreach, communication, and advocacy at state and local levels in order to improve overall funding. The discussion groups stressed the need for inclusion of diverse voices and particularly involving digital natives and members outside the traditional GLAM community in the effort.

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES & NEEDS

Evan Robb, Washington State Library, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify existing training options for digital projects, with emphasis on free/inexpensive options.
- Identify training gaps for institutions/individuals and recommend new courses/training options to fill those needs.

The training opportunities and needs discussion groups identified specific areas in which training is needed at the state and regional level. Where possible, they recommended the use of webinars to reach a larger group of students and to allow people opportunities to view sessions on a flexible schedule through recordings.

Several models for collaborative training at the state and local levels already exist. The Sustainable Heritage Network (<http://www.sustainableheritagenetwork.org>) developed by the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries and Museums (ATALM), which has nodes at Washington State University and Oregon State University, is one model that might be leveraged. The Oregon Heritage MentorCorps (<http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/OHC/pages/mentorcorps.aspx>) supported by the Oregon Heritage Commission is another, along with the Washington Rural Heritage project supported by the Washington State Library. In addition to re-using training materials already created for these projects, the focus should be on encouraging institutions and individuals to partner with existing training efforts whenever possible rather than re-inventing the wheel.

The groups specifically requested training at a variety of levels. They observed that there are many “beginner” options currently available, and that “advanced” training is available to institutions that can afford it. They saw that the primary need was for “intermediate” training on topics such as copyright and metadata. For example, a metadata training opportunity might involve preparing existing metadata for conversion to Linked Data, using tools like Google Refine. They also recommended training opportunities on less-common topics, such as policy development.

The groups also stressed the importance of informal training opportunities, through mechanisms like email, Google Groups, LinkedIn, and Facebook. They asked for real-world examples from recognized experts and a forum in which to share documentation and best practices so that institutions are not tasked with starting from scratch.

DIGITIZATION PRIORITIES

Geoff Wexler, Oregon Historical Society, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify content types and topics to prioritize for digitization, focusing on gaps in existing digital content with respect to media or other content type, topics, and temporal and spatial representation.
- Identify a common goal/theme for institutions across the state to develop digital content for in the next 18 months, possibly centered on a commemoration or other topic.

The digitization priorities discussion groups identified three priorities for digitization and digital conversion:

- Audio-visual materials, many of which are at risk due to format degradation
- Existing born-digital materials in obsolete formats or on unsupported platforms, including materials on the web and digital photos, films, texts, and similar materials that are at risk. The need for ongoing preservation of digital content should be recognized through the lifecycle of digital projects.
- Materials from under-represented communities, including first nation communities, with the recognition that cultural norms should be considered prior to making such materials available to the general public.

In each of these priorities, there needs to be recognition that some materials cannot or should not be shared, due to copyright or cultural issues. A collaborative effort to educate funders about the value of such projects is essential to their success.

In terms of topical priorities, the discussion groups saw opportunities around oral and community history projects as being ways to encourage broad participation. A topic effort focused on World War II could be adopted by institutions through the region, working with surviving veterans and their families to preserve memories of that conflict. Projects such as “Century of Action” focused on women’s suffrage in Oregon (<http://centuryofaction.org>) could provide a model for such efforts.

FUNDING SOURCES & NEEDS

Karen Estlund, University of Oregon, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify sources of funding already available that can be appealed to for assistance with effort (either collaboratively or individually).
- Identify gaps in funding by type of institution and/or project

The funding sources & needs discussion groups took a broad look at funding opportunities, making the point that projects such as the ones discussed during the morning session can’t be done for free. In response to the variability of “soft” funding in the form of grants, they also recognized that so-called “hard” funding is also variable, suggesting that a broader survey of donor and funder interests might be necessary to promote long-term sustainability.

Like the digitization priorities groups, the funding discussion groups stressed the need for funding for “dark” preservation of materials that cannot be made public, as well as funding for physical and digital preservation and for long-term maintenance and support of digital project infrastructure.

One model the groups recommended considering is the fee-for-services model, which could allow institutions to recover some of the costs of digital conversion and preservation, including storage. Note that this is different from fee-for-access; in the fee-for-services model, the costs are paid by institutions and individuals with content to be digitized, often by peer institutions or by centralized service providers, not by end users. While some of these costs could be charged to grant funds, developing institutional support for such services is a priority.

Funding uncertainties have led many institutions to be conservative in their digital project efforts. The discussion groups stressed the importance of taking risks and being bold, instead.

PROVIDING CONTENT AND SERVICES

Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify existing systems for hosting/aggregation of digital content and options for digitization/metadata creation
- Identify gaps in service and recommend new systems that can be implemented collaboratively for improved service, esp. to smaller institutions

The providing content & services discussion groups identified systems in use or in development at the Washington Rural Heritage project, the Orbis Cascade Alliance, and the Internet Archive as being possible systems for hosting and aggregating existing content. They recommended the development of a toolkit or white paper summarizing the options and offering guidelines for other projects looking to develop similar systems, along with development of a directory and email list devoted to such topics.

Systems intended for collaborative hosting should offer the following:

- A model for participation or membership, possibly involving a fee for participation that would support the shared service.
- Training and development opportunities
- Content flexibility (format-neutral systems) as well as systems that are format-specific when appropriate, as in the case of the Oregon and Washington newspaper projects.
- Customizable public interfaces
- An architecture supporting long-term preservation

In addition, they recommended that systems be affordable, easy to maintain, and compatible with search engines to improve discoverability.

Shortly after the meeting, the “Hydra-in-a-Box” project was announced by DPLA, Stanford, and DuraSpace (<http://dp.la/info/2015/04/15/far-reaching-hydra-in-a-box-joint-initiative-funded-by-ims/>). This project may support the type of applications recommended by the discussion groups, though the administration and support of systems relying on these applications would still need to be addressed. Long-term costs for this project are unknown, but this is an area where experimentation could be rewarded. Formation of a group to pursue a pilot project based on this model should be a high priority.

STANDARDS & BEST PRACTICES

Ann Lally, University of Washington, facilitator

Charges:

- Identify existing best practices that can or should be adopted, including the areas of digitization, metadata creation, and interoperability
- Review options for standardizing or at least harmonizing approaches to sharing digital content, with focus on intellectual property/copyright.

The standards and best practices discussion groups focused on ways to minimize effort in standards adoption and normalization. They advocated for broader use of crosswalks for mapping metadata from one project to another and the adoption of “good enough” or minimum level standards that can be met by the widest possible range of institutions.

The groups recommended the development of a toolkit addressing standards and copyright information and the adoption of model standards by funding agencies that would address digitization standards and also practices for long-term preservation of digital content.

The groups were willing to consider adoption of the DPLA Metadata Application Profile (<http://dp.la/info/developers/map/>) and policies for aggregating content, citing their known interoperability and scalability. Individual projects should be encouraged to crosswalk their metadata to the DPLA MAP and to identify areas for remediation or improvement.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the discussions at the summit and conversations with key stakeholders, there are several actions that the Oregon and Washington State Libraries can take to assist with a regional digital projects effort. Some of these actions will require financial commitments, while others may require discussions about policy.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Host a summit of funding agencies to work toward adoption of shared standards for digitization and metadata. The Oregon State Library and Oregon Heritage Commission are already meeting regularly and sharing information about their funding opportunities, and these conversations can be expanded to include other regional funders.
2. Explore support for a shared digital content system, possibly based on the Washington Rural Heritage project. The goal of a regional system would be to include content from throughout the region, working with a diverse set of institutions. Additionally, the system could be used to host digital collections that are considered to be “at risk” due to limitations at the local level, although the primary purpose of the system would be access, not preservation. Another element of such a system would be expanded training opportunities around digital content and digitization for all interested institutions.
3. Support existing local and regional collaborative digitization projects, as well as existing statewide newspaper digitization programs in both Washington and Oregon. Encourage projects to add new members and seek funding, including the exploration of fee-for-service models, to improve long-term sustainability of their services and to leverage existing equipment and infrastructure. As new standards and best practices for digitization, digital preservation and access, and metadata are developed, support system migration and upgrades.
4. Develop various written materials (toolkits, outreach materials, etc.) focused on broad community participation and establish a shared email list for distribution of materials and project updates. Whenever possible, outreach materials should be submitted to existing publications, such as the Oregon Heritage Commission’s *Heritage Bulletins* or the Northwest Archivists regional association’s *Easy Access* newsletter. A volunteer group of editors including representatives of a variety of types and sizes of institutions should be organized to ensure that materials are jargon-free and broadly accessible.
5. Encourage institutions in Washington and Oregon to form one or more initial collaborative project(s) focused on eventual participation in the Digital Public Library of America, perhaps through the DPLA/Stanford/DuraSpace “Hydra-in-a-Box” project. While the “Hydra-in-a-Box” software will not be ready for distribution sooner than fall 2017, a regional project could apply for LSTA, IMLS, or other funding to resolve issues of digital content and metadata aggregation, shared governance, and long-term support for infrastructure and staffing of the resulting repository system.
6. Support the option of participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Content Creation & Dissemination (CCD) Program for OCA members. This program will continue the regional aggregation of archival finding aids through the Archives West Portal and may eventually support platforms for sharing and preserving digital content, with the possible long-term goal of contributing metadata about that content to DPLA. Support for this effort could include promotion of the CCD program in regional marketing materials and grant funding for specific CCD projects and programs that serve broader regional goals.

Many of these recommendations restate or are related to recommendations in the 2013 Oregon Digital Collections report. The primary challenge not resolved at this meeting is “who will do the work?” Several Summit participants took the opportunity to provide further comments on the charge and role of a regional Steering Committee tasked with oversight of digital collections. One participant noted that “A statewide task

force should be assembled by the end of 2015, to meet in early 2016. This could be coordinated by the OSL or OHS.” Another suggested having separate steering committees for Oregon and Washington, with regular joint meetings to coordinate strategy on a regional basis.

Representatives of smaller institutions at the Summit reported that it is difficult to find the time and resources to participate in collaborative projects, while representatives from larger institutions discussed multiple competing priorities as barriers to participation. While resource constraints are real, summit participants reported a desire to continue to work together to explore options and an appreciation of the leadership shown by the Oregon and Washington State Libraries and the members of the planning committee for organizing the event. The overall comments on the Summit were positive. One participant noted, “There is such a great need for coordinated digital access to archival materials. The summit was a great first step and I hope that the steering committee can build on the momentum.”

NEXT STEPS

Based on the discussions at the Summit and the comments received in response to the draft Summit report, there are four recommended next steps.

1. Host a summit of funding agencies to work toward adoption of shared standards for digitization and metadata. The goal of this meeting would be to ensure that future digitization projects meet minimum levels of quality for both the digital images and the metadata that describes them.
2. Schedule a second regional meeting in spring or summer 2016 to continue the conversations begun at the 2015 Summit. “Annual or regular meetings like the Summit to continue the conversation” was rated as the highest priority for continued action in comments received after the Summit. One respondent noted, “There is such a great need for coordinated digital access to archival materials. The summit was a great first step and I hope that the steering committee can build on the momentum.” The focus of this meeting should be developing a strategic plan for digital collections in the region, with a secondary goal of identifying sources of funding to support a regional effort. Possible funding sources include grants from the Institute of Museum and Libraries Services through its National Leadership Grant program; funding from the Digital Public Library of America, which in June 2015 announced that it had received grants from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation to form Service Hubs in all fifty states by 2017; and regional funders, identified at a funder’s summit, whose support could also be used to match funds for national grants.
3. In order to plan the second Summit and to provide input to the summit of funding agencies, invite key participants from institutions with digital collections to form an initial Steering Committee. Emphasis should be placed on identifying participants from a variety of types and sizes of institutions. Several Summit participants noted that jargon and “network-speak” were an obstacle for them at the meeting, and the Steering Committee should be selected with the goal of ensuring that future efforts are broadly accessible to all interested participants.
4. Identify and broadly promote low or no-cost training opportunities at a variety of levels. While not rated as a priority for Summit participants, an email list is a simple way to ensure that participants and others get information about training opportunities; the Oregon State Library has expressed willingness to host such a list. Participants also identified a webpage with information about existing collaborative projects, standards and best practices, and both training and funding opportunities as being a high priority for sharing information. While such a webpage might initially be created by the Oregon or Washington State Library, maintenance of it should be a responsibility of the Steering Committee.

APPENDICES

1. Planning Process
2. Summit Invitation
3. Summit Agenda
4. Summit Discussion Table Topics & Charges
5. Summit Discussion Procedures
6. Summit Participant Resources & Related Material
7. Summit Participants

APPENDIX 1: PLANNING PROCESS

The committee met regularly for four months to plan the meeting. The meetings were held by telephone and teleconference, although substantial discussions also were conducted over email.

DATE

The date of Friday, March 20, 2015, was selected due to a relative lack of conflicts. Initially the committee explored the possibility of timing the meeting to coincide with the Association of College and Research Libraries 2015 conference, which was held in Portland, OR, but representatives of academic libraries felt that this would actually create more conflicts in terms of travel and logistics than it would solve. Similar objections were made concerning state library and museum conferences. A neutral date not associated with any other meeting was preferred.

LOCATION

Various locations for the summit were discussed, but eventually the committee decided to hold the meeting in Salem, Oregon, at the Oregon State Library due to availability of meeting space and comparatively inexpensive housing options for attendees. While the committee recognized that the location would make attendance impossible for some potential participants, they felt that no location would be perfect for all attendees given the distances involved.

ATTENDEES

Members of the planning committee nominated individuals from institutions and tribal communities in Oregon and Washington. In order to include the broadest possible participation, the committee made the decision to limit the number of attendees from a single institution; whenever possible, only one representative of an institution was invited to participate, though a second member from each of the institutions represented on the planning committee was allowed in recognition of the fact that the planning committee members would have other duties that would prevent them from fully engaging in discussions.

Originally, the total number of attendees was capped at 35. As the committee discussed possible participants, however, it became obvious that reasonable participation across the variety of institutions in the region could not be achieved without increasing that number. Eventually, a limit of fifty participants was agreed upon, although nearly one hundred participants were considered and almost seventy were contacted for possible participation. Forty-nine participants were present for the summit on March 20; the list is attached as Appendix 7.

AGENDA

Planning committee members discussed several possible outcomes for the meeting. Although many members of the committee hoped that the meeting would result in the formation of an Advisory Group to continue discussions and work on ways to improve collaboration and cooperative in digital projects on a regional basis, including the formation of a regional service hub for the Digital Public Library of America, the eventual focus of the agenda was on discussions around several themes. Because of the diversity of participants, the committee decided to invite representatives of different types of collaborative projects to share information about their projects with participants in the summit, to provide some common frames of reference in discussions.

The agenda ultimately included a presentation by Emily Gore, DPLA Director for Content, and short presentations by representatives of seven other collaborative projects in Washington and Oregon. Following those presentations, the agenda called for participants to discuss various topics with defined charges. The final topics were Outreach & Communication, Leadership & Collaboration, Training Opportunities & Needs, Digitization Priorities, Funding Sources & Needs, Infrastructure (renamed Providing Content and Services), and Standards & Best Practices. A list of the discussion topics and charges is included in Appendix 4.

Each planning committee member agreed to facilitate one of the discussion table topics, with Danielle Cunniff Plumer facilitating the meeting overall. Mary Mara from City University in Seattle was asked to facilitate the final discussion topic. Because Emily Gore could not attend in person, arrangements were made to allow her to present by teleconference, but no other virtual attendees were allowed.

REPORT AND PARTICIPANT INPUT

Following the summit, the planning committee decided that it would be best to invite summit participants to comment on the draft report and recommendations from the summit before disseminating them widely. Accordingly, Danielle Cunniff Plumer designed a survey to send to summit participants, although due to time constraints the survey was not ready until several months after the meeting. The results from the survey will be incorporated into the final report.

In June 2015, Summit participants, along with a few people who had received invitations to the Summit but were unable to attend, were sent a draft report on the results of the Summit and were asked to comment on specific recommendations as well as on table topic discussions. A total of 18 Summit participants responded to the request for comments. Of those responses, seven of the respondents self-identified as librarians, seven identified as archivists, two as museum professionals, plus two “other” (archaeologist and anthropologist). Thirteen of the respondents stated that they worked in Oregon, four in Washington, and one did not respond to this question.

Overall, thirteen of the respondents stated that the Summit was valuable to them in terms of knowledge gained, networking opportunities, or potential for further collaboration. Two respondents were neutral, and two responded that the Summit had offered little or no value. However, one respondent noted that “I left overwhelmed. Jargon and network speak bogged down communication with those practiced in metadata. Must be made accessible to those responsible for digital archives, but not trained in the technical aspects.” The issues of jargon and overall accessibility of information will need to be addressed in any future efforts to coordinate the efforts of a large and diverse community of digital collections specialists on a regional basis.

The overall comments on the Summit were positive. One respondent noted, “There is such a great need for coordinated digital access to archival materials. The summit was a great first step and I hope that the steering committee can build on the momentum.” Another reported that “The most valuable thing to me about Summit in this initial stage was learning more about the smaller institutions, their collections, and their needs and priorities.”

Respondents were asked to rate their support for each of the six Summit recommendations on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being “I do not support” and 7 being “I strongly support.” Respondents were also given the opportunity to comment on each recommendation. Overall, all of the recommendations received some support, though the comments on recommendation #3, “Support the option of participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Content Creation & Dissemination (CCD) Program” suggested that respondents were concerned that support for Orbis Cascade’s CCD Program might come at the expense of support for other recommendations that have a more inclusive potential membership, with one respondent noting “My repository [sic] is not a member of Orbis and would have difficulty justifying the expense of membership.”

Recommendations	Average Rating	Ranking
Host a summit of funding agencies to work toward adoption of shared standards for digitization and metadata. The Oregon State Library and Oregon Heritage Commission are already meeting regularly and sharing information about their funding opportunities, and these conversations can be expanded to include other regional funders.	6.12	1
Explore support for a shared digital content system, possibly based on the Washington Rural Heritage project. The goal of a regional system would be to include content from throughout the region, working with a diverse set of institutions. Additionally, the system could be used to host digital collections that are considered to be “at risk” due to limitations at the local level, although the primary purpose of the system would be access, not preservation. Another element of such a system would be expanded training opportunities around digital content and digitization for all interested institutions.	5.88	2
Support existing collaborative programs such as Washington Heritage Online, Washington County Heritage Online, and Southern Oregon Digital Archives, as well as newspaper programs in both Washington and Oregon. Encourage these existing programs to add new members and seek funding to improve long-term sustainability of their services. As new standards and best practices for digitization, digital preservation and access, and metadata are developed, encourage existing projects to migrate their systems to keep up.	5.81	3
Develop various written materials (toolkits, outreach materials, etc.) focused on broad community participation and establish a shared email list for distribution of materials and project updates. Whenever possible, outreach materials should be submitted to existing publications, such as the Oregon Heritage Commission’s Heritage Bulletins or the Northwest Archivists regional association’s Easy Access newsletter. A volunteer group of editors including representatives of a variety of types and sizes of institutions should be organized to ensure that materials are jargon-free and broadly accessible.	5.53	4
Encourage institutions in Washington and Oregon to form one or more initial collaborative project(s) focused on eventual participation in the Digital Public Library of America, perhaps through the DPLA/Stanford/DuraSpace “Hydra-in-a-Box” project. While the “Hydra-in-a-Box” software will not be ready for distribution sooner than fall 2017, a regional project could apply for LSTA, IMLS, or other funding to resolve issues of digital content and metadata aggregation, shared governance, and long-term support for infrastructure and staffing of the resulting repository system.	5.13	5
Support the option of participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Content Creation & Dissemination (CCD) Program for OCA members. This program will continue the regional aggregation of archival finding aids through the Archives West Portal and may eventually support platforms for sharing and preserving digital content, with the possible long-term goal of contributing metadata about that content to DPLA. Support for this effort could include promotion of the CCD program in regional marketing materials and grant funding for specific CCD projects and programs that serve broader regional goals.	4.53	6

Table 1. Summit recommendations in priority order based on respondent feedback.

In order to continue the work of the Summit, respondents were asked to rank seven options for further networking and sharing of information, though the question noted that funding for future networking had not been identified. The ranking was on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being the top recommendation. Overall, holding annual or regular meetings like the Summit had the greatest appeal, with eleven of seventeen respondents rating it as their first or second choice. “Formal organization with separate steering committee to pursue funding and provide opportunities for collaboration, including participation in DPLA,” “Additional low or no-cost training opportunities at a variety of levels,” and “Webpage with information about existing collaborative projects, standards and best practices, and both training and funding opportunities” were very close in terms of overall ranking, but the establishment of a formal organization to pursue funding and opportunities for collaboration received substantially more first and second place rankings.

Options for further networking and sharing of information	Overall rating	Rank
Annual or regular meetings like the Summit to continue the conversation.	2.59	1
Formal organization with separate steering committee to pursue funding and provide opportunities for collaboration, including participation in DPLA.	3.41	2
Additional low or no-cost training opportunities at a variety of levels.	3.50	3
Webpage with information about existing collaborative projects, standards and best practices, and both training and funding opportunities.	3.65	4
Shared digital asset management system to which my institution can contribute content.	4.33	5
Email list for Summit attendees and others who may choose to join.	4.88	6
Packet with outreach materials to share at my institution and with other institutions in the area.	5.13	7

Table 2. Ranking of future networking and information sharing options.

Respondents were also given the option to respond to any of the discussion table topics. Only the discussion of the “Leadership and Collaboration” discussion topic received enough responses to merit further analysis, with five respondents offering comments. This discussion topic was originally charged to:

- Identify scope of effort - local, statewide, regional - and how scope affects possible collaborations.
- Identify responsibilities of steering committee or other group tasked with coordinating effort

Respondents were asked to rank the responsibilities of a regional steering committee tasked with oversight of digital collections. Setting standards for digitization and developing a strategic plan for collaborative activities were the top two options, while setting standards for metadata was surprisingly last. One respondent noted, “I think a strategic plan is the highest priority so that all involved know how to move forward,” while another offered that “I would love to see the Oregon State Library take a leadership role in either developing a statewide digital project, or in forming a collaborative effort with the Washington State Library, leveraging their Washington Rural Heritage project as a model.”

This topic also asked respondents to identify ways to recruit people to serve on this Steering Committee. Three respondents offered comments:

- “A statewide task force should be assembled by the end of 2015, to meet in early 2016. This could be coordinated by the OSL or OHS.”
- “would it make sense to have both a WA and OR steering committee and then have them meet once or twice a year to coordinate their various projects, exchange information, etc?”
- “Maybe reach out to the large institutions who have robust digitization programs and delegate outreach to them. They most likely know their smaller communities and might have the resources for outreach.”

The complete responses to the draft Summit report are available as Appendix 8. These include the responses to the table discussion topics as well as the overall responses.

APPENDIX 2. SUMMIT INVITATION

February 9, 2015

On behalf of Oregon and Washington State Libraries, we would like to formally invite you to the Northwest Digital Collections Summit Meeting. The meeting will be held at the Oregon State Library in Salem on March 20, 2015. To facilitate planning for lunch and parking, **we ask that you confirm your ability to attend the meeting. Please register at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NWDigSummit> by March 9, 2015.**

In 2013, Oregon's Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Advisory Council directed the State Library to commission a formal report on current and potential models for projects in the state and region in order to allocate LSTA funding for digital collection projects for maximum effect. This [report](#), completed by Danielle Plumer in September 2013 included a number of recommendations, including the need to convene a meeting to discuss areas of potential collaboration among institutions undertaking digital collection projects.

The purpose of this meeting is to bring together interested parties representing a diversity of cultural institutions to discuss avenues for collaboration on digital collections of cultural heritage material in Oregon and Washington. This meeting is a first step towards building a broader strategy for collaboration in the region. The Oregon State Library, with the support of the Washington State Library, is happy to sponsor the meeting. We are pleased that Emily Gore, Director for Content for the [Digital Public Library of America](#), will attend virtually to review models for collaboration in use at DPLA hubs. Danielle Plumer will facilitate and develop a report on the discussions at the meeting.

We also thank members of the planning committee of this meeting for working with Danielle to establish the agenda for the meeting.

Karen Estlund, University of Oregon
Evan Robb, Washington State Library
Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission
Ann Lally, University of Washington
Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Geoff Wexler, Oregon Historical Society

In order to facilitate an optimum environment for these initial discussions, we are unable to have participation from every interested party in the region at this meeting. However, it is expected that further opportunities to discuss issues will be a likely outcome of this first step. We will also broadly share the information generated during this meeting and we hope that our participants will share with others in their region and/or sector.

Additional details about the meeting can be found at: <http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/Pages/NWDigSummit.aspx> or you may contact Arlene Weible, arlene.weible@state.or.us or [503-378-5020](tel:503-378-5020).

Thank you for your participation in this initial meeting. We appreciate your assistance as we work towards a strategic vision for digital collections collaboration for our region.

Sincerely,

MaryKay Dahlgreen
Oregon State Librarian

Rand Simmons
Washington State Librarian

APPENDIX 3. SUMMIT AGENDA

10 a.m. - 11 a.m.	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome by Oregon State Library• Meeting process overview – Danielle Cunniff Plumer• Attendee introductions <p><i>Provide your name, institution, state, and a one sentence statement about what you hope the meeting will accomplish for your institution, state, and community.</i></p>
11 a.m. - noon	Discussion of models for collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DPLA – Emily Gore (by GoToMeeting)• Existing projects<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Univ. of Washington○ Univ. of Oregon○ Orbis Cascade Alliance Content Creation & Dissemination Team○ NWDA/Archives West○ Washington County Heritage Online○ Southern Oregon Digital Archives○ Washington Rural Heritage
12 - 12:45 p.m.	Lunch <p><i>Informal discussions about models for collaboration</i></p>
12:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Reports from lunch discussion groups
1:00 - 1:15 p.m.	Break/re-organize
1:15 - 2:00 p.m.	Discussion groups <p><i>See topics/charges on next page</i></p>
2:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Break/re-organize
2:15 - 3:00 p.m.	Discussion groups <p><i>See topics/charges on next page</i></p>
3:00 - 3:15 p.m.	Break/general discussion
3:15 - 3:45 p.m.	Reports from breakout group facilitators
3:45 - 4:00 p.m.	Closing remarks/next steps

APPENDIX 4. SUMMIT DISCUSSION TABLE TOPICS & CHARGES

Outreach & Communication - Table 1, Room 102/103

Facilitator: Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission

1. Identify methods/best practices to keep individuals/organizations informed about effort, funding opportunities, training opportunities, best practices, etc.
2. Identify methods to increase visibility of digital collections to the broader community

Leadership & Collaboration - Table 2, Room 102/103

Facilitator: Mary Mara, City University of Seattle, Seattle, WA

1. Identify scope of effort - local, statewide, regional - and how scope affects possible collaborations.
2. Identify responsibilities of steering committee or other group tasked with coordinating effort

Training Opportunities & Needs - Table 3, Room 102/103

Facilitator: Evan Robb, Washington State Library

1. Identify existing training options for digital projects, with emphasis on free/inexpensive options.
2. Identify training gaps for institutions/individuals and recommend new courses/training options to fill those needs.

Digitization Priorities - Table 4, Room 102/103

Facilitator: Geoff Wexler, Oregon Historical Society

1. Identify content types and topics to prioritize for digitization, focusing on gaps in existing digital content with respect to media or other content type, topics, and temporal and spatial representation.
2. Identify a common goal/theme for institutions across the state to develop digital content for in the next 18 months, possibly centered on a commemoration or other topic.

Funding Sources & Needs - Table 5, Room 101

Facilitator: Karen Estlund, University of Oregon

1. Identify sources of funding already available that can be appealed to for assistance with effort (either collaboratively or individually).
2. Identify gaps in funding by type of institution and/or project

Providing Content and Services - Table 6, Room 202, 2nd Floor

Facilitator: Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library

1. Identify existing systems for hosting/aggregation of digital content and options for digitization/metadata creation
2. Identify gaps in service and recommend new systems that can be implemented collaboratively for improved service, esp. to smaller institutions

Standards & Best Practices - Table 7, Basement Conference Room

Facilitator: Ann Lally, University of Washington

1. Identify existing best practices that can or should be adopted, including the areas of digitization, metadata creation, and interoperability
2. Review options for standardizing or at least harmonizing approaches to sharing digital content, with focus on intellectual property/copyright.

APPENDIX 5. SUMMIT DISCUSSION PROCEDURES

General Procedures for all participants:

- Use of computers, smart phones, tablets, etc. during the meeting is discouraged. We want all participants to be fully involved with the discussion. All devices MUST be set to silent mode.
- You have been assigned to a table for the lunchtime discussion activity; the table number is listed on your nametag. For the afternoon discussion activities, you will be asked to choose two discussion tables addressing two different topics. Unless we need to balance the numbers, we won't ask anyone to switch tables. We do ask that you not switch tables once the discussion has started in order to minimize distractions.
- Please do not live blog the meeting (including Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and other communication venues). A report from the meeting will be prepared by Danielle Cunniff Plumer with assistance from the Planning Team and staff from the Oregon and Washington State Libraries. We will get this out as soon as possible following the meeting, probably within a month.
- We want people to be honest in the discussions and to share opinions that may not be representative of their institution's policies or interests. To help make this a comfortable venue for sharing information, we ask that participants follow the Chatham House Rule in notes, comments, and other communications outside the meeting, with the exception that the list of participants will be available as a matter of public record.
 - When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed - See more at: <http://www.chathamhouse.org/about/chatham-house-rule/chatham-house-rule-translations#sthash.IrfSOiRH.dpuf>
- You are here because your opinion matters, and we want you to be an active participant in the discussion. If you feel uncomfortable in the discussion for any reason, including culturally or personally insensitive remarks, please talk to a Planning Team member and we will work to resolve the situation

APPENDIX 6. PARTICIPANT RESOURCES & RELATED MATERIAL

Oregon State Library

- Oregon State LSTA Plan, 2013-2017
<http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/LSTA/1staplanfinaljune27.pdf>
- Digital Collections Plan
<http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/Pages/projects/digicollections/index.aspx>

Washington State Library

- Washington State LSTA Plan, 2013-2017
[Washington State LSTA Five Year Plan 2013 – 2017](#)
- Washington Rural Heritage Guidelines
<http://www.washingtonruralheritage.org/cdm/search/collection/wrh>
- Digital Special Collections in the Pacific Northwest
<http://www.washingtonruralheritage.org/cdm/resources>
 - To add your collection, email evan.robb@sos.wa.gov with the name, physical location, and URL of your institution

Oregon Heritage Commission

- Oregon Heritage Plan, 2014-2019
<http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/OHC/docs/HeritagePlan.pdf>

Northwest Digital Archives (NWDA) / Archives West

- NWDA Best Practices for Encoded Archival Description
<https://www.orbiscascade.org/best-practices-for-ead>
 - EAD Best Practices Group
<https://www.orbiscascade.org/standards-working-group-fy15>
- Orbis Cascade Alliance Content Creation & Dissemination Team
<https://www.orbiscascade.org/ccd>

Digital Public Library of America

- Strategic Plan, 2015-2017
http://dp.la/info/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/DPLA-StrategicPlan_2015-2017-Jan7.pdf
- Introduction to the DPLA Metadata Application Profile (v4.0). March 5, 2015.
http://dp.la/info/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Intro_to_DPLA_metadata_model.pdf
- Hubs (Service & Content) Overview
<http://dp.la/info/hubs/>
- Hubs Application (for cycle ending Jan. 16)
<http://dp.la/info/hubs/become-a-hub/>

APPENDIX 7. SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

Planning Team:

Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Evan Robb, Washington State Library
Geoff Wexler, Oregon Historical Society
Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission
Karen Estlund, University of Oregon
Ann Lally, University of Washington
Danielle Cunniff Plumer, facilitator

Participants:

Jodi Allison-Bunnell
Orbis Cascade Alliance
Missoula, MT

Richard Aroksaar
National Park Service,
Pacific West Regional Library
Seattle, WA

Michael Boock
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR

Colleen Brazil
Sno-Isle Libraries
Marysville, WA

Patti Cammack
Whitman County Library
Colfax, WA

Participant Map:



Kelly Cannon-Miller
Deschutes Historical Society
Bend, OR

Mary Jane Cedar Face
Southern Oregon University
Ashland, OR

Mark Dahl
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, OR

Karen Estlund
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

Jodee Fenton
Seattle Public Library
Seattle, WA

Erica Findley
Multnomah County Libraries
Portland, OR

Jean Fisher
Tacoma Public Library
Tacoma, WA

Ross Fuqua
Washington County
Cooperative Library Services
Hillsboro, OR

Shawna Gandy
Oregon Historical Society
Portland, OR

Emily Gore
DPLA
Washington, DC

Eva Guggemos
Pacific University
Forest Grove, OR

Mary Hammer
Washington State Archives
Olympia, WA

Serenity Ibsen
Pacific Northwest College of Art
Portland, OR

Kyle Jansson
Oregon Heritage Commission
Salem, OR

Anne Jenner
Univ. of Washington Libraries
Seattle, WA

Elizabeth Joffrion
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA

Todd Kepple
Klamath County Museum
Klamath Falls, OR

Ann Lally
Univ. of Washington Libraries
Seattle, WA

David Lewis
Ethnohistory Research, LLC
Salem, OR

Mary Mara
City University of Seattle
Seattle, WA

Tom Mara
KEXP Community Radio
Seattle, WA

Todd Mayberry
Oregon Nikkei Legacy Center
Portland, OR

Veronica Montano
Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde
Grand Ronde, OR

Katie Moss
Portland Art Museum
Portland, OR

Jennifer (Jenny) Mundy
Multnomah County Archives
Portland, OR

Mark O'English
Washington State University
Pullman, WA

Jennifer O'Neal
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

Cris Paschild
Portland State University
Portland, OR

Michael Paulus
Seattle Pacific University
Seattle, WA

Kelly Peterson-Fairchild
Oregon Institute of Technology
Klamath Falls, OR

Judy Pitchford
Washington State Library
Olympia, WA

Danielle Cunniff Plumer
DCPlumer Associates, L.L.C.
Austin, TX

Michele Reilly
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, WA

Kassandra Rippee
Coquille Indian Tribe
North Bend, OR

Evan Robb
Washington State Library
Olympia, WA

Layne Sawyer
Oregon State Archives
Salem, OR

Shawn Schollmeyer
Washington State Library
Olympia, WA

Perry Stokes
Baker County Library District
Baker City, OR

Terri Washburn
LaGrande Public Library
LaGrande, OR

Arlene Weible
Oregon State Library
Salem, OR

Susan Westin
Oregon State Library
Salem, OR

Geoff Wexler
Oregon Historical Society
Portland, OR

Malissa Minthorn Winks
Tamastlikt Cultural Institute,
Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Reservation
Pendleton, OR

APPENDIX 8. RESPONSES TO SUMMIT RECOMMENDATIONS