

**Information Hub Development Committee
Meeting December 6, 2000
Minutes**

Attending: Duryea Callaway, Willy Cromwell-Kessler, George Libbey, Scott Muir, Leo Papa, Karen Tubolino, Ann Walaskay

Review Agenda and Minutes

The November 1 meeting minutes were approved for general distribution.

Review from Joint Meeting with Steering Committee

Karen developed a draft chart of proposed committee organization within DALNET to be distributed after she reports to the Board on the joint meeting. Some of the proposed reporting lines may be in conflict with what the Board has approved in the past, e.g., the (Horizon) Steering Committee reporting to the IHDC instead of directly to the Board. Reporting lines could be established to both the IHDC and the Board.

Karen will report:

- Liaisons have been set up between IHDC and (Horizon) Steering Committee (Leo Papa to IHDC, Joan Emahiser alternate; George Libbey to (Horizon) Steering Committee, Karen Tubolino alternate).
- Listservs for each committee were opened on request to members of the other committee.
- Lines of communication among committees and to the Board need to be more clearly defined.
- IHDC is the more comprehensive committee
- New committee structure could help to decentralize decision-making and make the process more representative.
- The committees reached consensus on broad patterns and many specifics even to the point of the chart Karen will distribute.
- This was a very positive meeting; consensus was reached early, discussion of specifics took up most of the meeting.

Other discussion:

- The Project Managers' roles have changed. Originally set up to discuss options and implement Notis, their current role has stressed implementation rather than active discussion and recommendation of procedures. Occasional requests are generated through the Project Managers meetings, but the emphasis is on dissemination of information.
- Liaisons from each DALNET committee could be appointed to the IHDC, either for attending meetings or receiving listserv communications.
- Technical Advisory Group: would communicate directly with DALNET staff; this offers the potential of getting more expertise, more representation, and better distribution of tasks.

Survey

- 4 questions derived from Willy's original 10; to be sent to Project Managers and Board to reach DALNET members and affiliates first (e-mail distribution).
- The survey is intended to identify content; discussions of how collection can be treated start later.
- Add 5th question: additional comments.

- Retain some heading information.
- Retain some heading information; merge 1st paragraph from cover letter into top of survey; Please complete a separate form for each collection; Please include resources that are not currently available through the OPAC
- Survey to Project Managers meeting January 8; returns to Karen
- Scott will make revisions & distribute for comments

Criteria for evaluating projects: there are several options. Willy included several in minutes, stressing technological innovation; she will develop draft checklist for what projects fit; Leo will propose 10-12 standard questions based on grantee's expectations.

Survey in gathering information; IHDC should review, along with representatives from other committees. Checklist should be in place before evaluation of submissions; needs to reflect what fits in hub.

Project Plan for IHDC

Scott developed for initial discussion:

- Need some sort of collection development plan
- Should potential projects be evaluated like grant proposals? For their grant potential?
- Project plans should go to Board for approval; IHDC role can forward these
- Projects need to be identified as "major" or "prototype" or "testbed material"

DALNET's status: cooperative, technological, but not bleeding edge, unique for membership range. How will this help to define hub project, development? As we develop standards, how do we keep from being locked in by defaults, rather than setting our own?

Costume collection status: currently WSU, DIA, Detroit Historical Museum, Greenfield Village have materials; WSU leading, but have smaller collection. What technology will be used? How will it be licensed? Will it be available to other DALNET members? What impact will this have in the Grants Committee?

Third party software issues: how do we address using third party software for functions that can be provided by Horizon? Members can develop their own databases as they wish, but if this creates a drain on DALNET resources, who addresses this?

Task Forces:

Health: contract still pending

Cultural: how are projects being merged with IMLS proposal?

Economic: report January or later.

Metadata: no report

December 20 meeting: DPL or VA

Jan 3: UMD