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A message from Martín J. Gómez

In November 2011 library leaders from around the United States gathered in Los Angeles to explore strategies to enhance the role of public libraries in efforts to create a digital public library. We were joined by representatives from academic libraries, foundations and independent nonprofit organizations who believe as I do that the future of libraries is dependent on our engagement with communities and content. The tools required to create, share and provide access to digital content are rapidly becoming the fuel behind the creation of new knowledge and community empowerment.

The idea for this gathering came from my concern about the need for public libraries to be a greater part of any plan to create a digital library future. Public libraries have content that needs to be digitized and made more widely accessible. We have access to local users, and communities are creating content that is “born digital” and needs to be collected and shared more broadly. We also, as part of our collective mission, have an obligation to ensure that the interests and voices of the diverse communities we serve are represented in our digital future.

With the support of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Library Foundation of Los Angeles and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, it was my pleasure to welcome this initial group of public library leaders to Los Angeles to consider the question: What is the future of public libraries in the digital age? In our brief time together, we agreed that there is an urgent need to advance our consideration of this question. We also put forth a set of themes and suggested actions that we hope will enhance public library participation in the creation of our digital future and the public library’s role there. This report is a summary of our discussion, but more important, it is a call to action.

To public librarians across the U.S., I challenge you to join me and our colleagues in visioning and creating our digital future, together. Public libraries in every community must develop a digital strategy and link that strategy to local, state, regional and national initiatives. We must participate in ongoing policy discussions. We must invest in new technologies and formats, and push our vending partners to work with us. Please lend the unique contributions of your library and your community to the emerging effort to create our national digital library. The communities that we serve are counting on us to make sure that unique, local digital content is widely accessible and that books, films, audio recordings and other forms of recorded knowledge remain accessible—even as they move to digital formats—to all.

Martín J. Gómez
(Former) General Manager and City Librarian
Los Angeles Public Library
A movement is indeed underway.

New research from the Pew Research Center shows a surge in e-reader ownership, with both e-reader and tablet ownership nearly doubling from 10% to 19% between December 2011 and January 2012. This pronounced jump is on top of a trend that many experts have been tracking for some time. Even more recently, Apple launched two apps for authoring and reading highly interactive, multitouch textbooks on the iPad and they are partnering with major textbook publishers on textbooks for the high school level. Couple these activities with the 16 billion songs already downloaded on iTunes and the more than 20% of North American Web traffic attributed to customers streaming Netflix—and we know our future is digital.

Volume and availability of digital content, and the growing prominence of personal information technologies, have not simply shifted, but are completely transforming the way Americans live, work and play. This impacts the way we learn, what we know and with whom we connect.

But public libraries are behind in responding to the expectations of users in an increasingly digital age. If public library leaders embrace the seismic shift taking place in our homes, businesses, local communities and across the nation, it will not just refine or evolve public library services, but will transform public libraries altogether.
A direction for digital success

Speakers at the November meeting included:

- Stacey Aldrich, State Librarian, California State Library
- Meg Bellinger, Yale University, Director of the Office of Digital Assets and Infrastructure
- Tom Blake, Digital Projects Manager, Boston Public Library
- Peter Brantley, Director of the BookServer Project at the Internet Archive
- Kenneth S. Brecher, President of the Library Foundation of Los Angeles
- Linda Crowe, Chief Executive Officer of the Pacific Library Partnership
- Robin L. Dale, Director of Digital & Preservation Services for LYRASIS
- Cathy De Rosa, OCLC Vice President for the Americas and Global Vice President of Marketing
- Laine Farley, Executive Director, California Digital Library, University of California
- Kim Fender, Executive Director of the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County
- Rachel L. Frick, Director of the Digital Library Federation Program at the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR/DLF)
- Martin Gómez, Former General Manager and City Librarian, Los Angeles Public Library and current Vice Dean, University of Southern California Libraries
- Emily Gore, Associate Dean for Digital Scholarship and Technology Services at Florida State University
- Luis Herrera, City Librarian for the City and County of San Francisco
- Susan Hildreth, Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
- Carol Linn, Linn & Logan, Project Survey Results
- Patrick Losinski, CEO, Columbus Metropolitan Library
- Giovanna Mannino, Interim Director of the Richard J. Riordan Central Library, Los Angeles Public Library
- Maura Marx, Director of the Digital Public Library of America Secretariat at the Berkman Center at Harvard University
- Waller McGuire, Executive Director, St. Louis Public Library
- Mary Minow, Law Consultant, LibraryLaw.com
- Chip Nilges, OCLC Vice President, Business Development
- John Palfrey, Henry N. Ess Professor of Law/Vice Dean for Library and Information Resources at Harvard Law School
- Catherine Quinlan, Dean of University of Southern California Libraries
- Peggy Rudd, Director and Librarian of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission
- Amy Rudersdorf, Director of the Digital Information Management Program at the State Library of North Carolina
- Jamie Seemiller, Program Administrator for the IMLS grant, “Creating Your Community” at the Denver Public Library Western History/Genealogy Department
- Gary E. Strong, University Librarian, UCLA
- Ben Vershbow, Manager of NYPL Labs
- Jeremy York, Project Librarian for HathiTrust

In November 2011, more than 150 public library leaders and partners gathered to discuss the challenges currently facing public libraries in a digital age. Over the course of the two-day meeting, participants learned about the “Digital Public Library of America” (DPLA, http://dp.la), an initiative formed in 2010 at the Harvard Law School’s Berkman Center, supported by an initial grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Representatives from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, HathiTrust, Internet Archives, Digital Library Federation, LYRASIS, OCLC and others indicated broad interest from a variety of organizations that serve or work with public libraries.

The discussion focused on creating digital public libraries, and began with a series of panelists sharing current and proposed work in this area.

Panelists shared a variety of efforts already underway to “digitize public libraries.” Briefings included overviews of lessons learned from academic and research library projects with focused attention on how public libraries are experimenting with ways to use original digital content to engage local communities. There were discussions about how to engage national organizations and how to leverage existing assets within the field for building and sustaining a national or large, regional digital libraries. The discussions concluded with a full group dialogue on how best to attract more interest and awareness in the public library community regarding concerns and challenges, the need for ongoing efforts and next steps. A full agenda and participant list from the gathering are included as appendices to this document.

The purpose of this document is to summarize the primary recommendations from the discussion that took place at this gathering, including a proposed set of next steps for public library involvement in the ideation and creation of a national digital public library.
A digital library...necessary and urgent

Library leaders contributing to this discussion agreed: many public librarians feel behind in the evolution to a more digital library. Participants noted that academic and research libraries have made more strides in shaping a digital future, evidenced in the major projects and new efforts of organizations such as the HathiTrust. Participants also noted that the rapidly evolving digital activities in the commercial sector, such as e-books and e-book reading devices, are “changing the game” for public libraries, and that public libraries have been too slow in generating a national, concerted plan.

“If public libraries fail at this, communities will become more deeply divided between those who can participate in culture, civics and the workforce, and those who cannot.”

The current state

In advance of the meeting, an online survey was distributed to 1,751 public librarians (and 230 responded). The purpose of the survey was to get an initial sense of the current status of digital strategies, projects, tools and partners in public libraries. The full survey findings are included as an appendix.

Though the survey showed that very small public libraries provide their patrons with a wide range of digital content (through joining consortia and collaborating with larger or more technologically evolved libraries and institutions), the survey also identified that **46% of public libraries responding had no documented digital strategy.** Forty-one percent (41%) had not yet digitized materials while 50% of those with digitized items are in the early stages, with fewer than a thousand items digitized (n=229). Based on these and the other summary findings, public library participants expressed concern that more attention must be paid to changing the current state of digital strategies at public libraries.

These summary findings are enveloped in a broad societal and cultural shift discussion of how the public, and the patrons, are accessing and using digital content. Public expectations are high and will increase, making it more urgent to participate.

If public libraries fail to create and implement digital strategies—and participants in this meeting were in vehement agreement on this point—they will quickly, and maybe permanently, fall farther behind. Beyond the sustainability of public libraries, participants also agreed that communities without open, digital access are at risk of becoming more deeply divided—between those that have the opportunity to participate in culture, civics, the workforce and nearly every other aspect of American life, and those that do not.

Participants agreed that public library attention to digital solutions and services was both necessary and urgent, that community needs are driving this requirement, and that public libraries can bring significant value to the effort.
Community needs: free access, infinite discovery

Any consideration of a national digital public library must start with the needs and interests of the 315 million American residents who will have access to and benefit from this work.

Public library users expect free access and multiple points of discovery to information; they need and value information, but may not know where that information is held. Some will continue to enter public library buildings, and others will find the content libraries provide online without knowing where it came from. From a user perspective, coherent, unencumbered access is the goal. Public libraries have an opportunity to welcome this shift, and optimize both in-person, physical access and online, virtual access.

“Let’s not just re-create the current physical reality in the virtual realm, but something different and better. This is a clean slate.”

Participants urged one another to think of this opportunity as a “clean slate,” and to create something “different and better,” rather than re-creating the current reality in the virtual realm. Their goal is to bridge the past and future, and to devise a strategy that helps our communities learn, discover and share knowledge now and into the future.

Public librarians should aim high and seize the opportunity to meet new community needs now. Discussion in this meeting also surfaced the values that public libraries can bring to any effort to develop a digital public library. Attendees felt that those values should be the foundation for discussion and action on the following themes.

Library values: committed, open, collaborative

Business interests in the commercial sector are increasingly consolidating access with a few key providers, making it difficult for public libraries to fulfill their role. The result is that there are still significant portions of the population denied access to digital content that the public expects the public library to provide.

Looking at where public libraries allocate their resources now, the underlying priorities that should inform a vision of future library services become clear. This discussion began with and moved beyond what some called “musty old records” and surfaced a number of potential directions. Participants felt the following activities will remain vital for the future of public libraries:

- Meeting the basic and information literacy needs of kids, some of whom are growing up digital
- Acknowledging the popularity of current fiction, multimedia materials, reference and nonfiction items
- Ushering people onto new formats as publications formats shift
Being mindful of the economically disadvantaged and of those who may not have access to computers and digital content

Serving local community needs

Ensuring that materials are available through a compelling online environment that supports research and makes collections accessible to a global community of learners

Developing interfaces intended for users, not retrofitting ones used for management

Providing a public space for community gathering, public discourse and intellectual stimulation.

If the future includes continued, free and public access even to digital content, plans can draw on the values and the assets of public libraries to guide us in getting there.

Public libraries are a unique asset in the design and building of a digital public library: They know, and are deeply committed to the communities they serve. Public library concerns for the public interest are perhaps unparalleled in the ecosystem of institutional players that will be engaged in this effort. Public libraries will come to the table ready to serve the public interest of current and future users.

“There is a library movement underway. The movement involves the development of a vision that will soon become a reality: a global digital library.”

Beyond representing and involving local communities, participants called for “radical collaboration” among all players, recognizing there are many potential partners in this effort and that everyone has something to contribute. Being open, agile and easily adaptive will help create something that is sustainable and valued. Collaboration will reduce redundancy and strengthen the library voice in the digital age.

In moments of feeling too far behind or overwhelmed with the scale of these opportunities, participants in the meeting provided observations and encouragement for their colleagues. They might be best summed up by the concluding remarks of our host:

“Let’s get started.”
Building blocks for our digital future

Any plan for an effort as far-reaching as building digital libraries will consist of many complex interlocking parts. Success won’t be determined by correctly mapping and categorizing all of the various steps and initiatives—it will rely more on the willingness of participants to come together and work toward common goals. Nevertheless, placing possible activities and requirements in a framework is helpful—both for moving specific discussions forward, and for breaking down what may seem like an insurmountable challenge into more concrete, actionable tasks.

Create

All content will be born digital. The tools used to capture, store and share digital objects will evolve rapidly, and public libraries must all evolve to ensure the best possible access to materials.

Collaborate

Collaboration will be “radical.” Many have a critical role to play, including authors, selectors, tool-makers, preservers, librarians, aggregators, publishers, policy-makers and users.

Communicate

Places and spaces and plans for robust conversations among librarians, users and local decision-makers are essential.

Navigate

A sustainable digital library model must be both flexible and encompass the broad information environment, policy and legal landscape.
Create the digital content experience

As public libraries enter the digital information milieu, there are at least three “digital content vectors” in which public libraries must focus energies. One participant illustrated these in an original sketch, and posted it to Flickr during the meeting.

In determining how to create the best digital content experience for users, public libraries will need to deal with a variety of content considerations, questions of current and future technology, and ensuring that staff competencies meet whatever activities are put forward.

Content considerations

Consideration of these vectors raised a number of questions. Should public libraries:

- Digitize and archive unique content that we already own, or collect and share content that was born digital?
- License commercial content or provide users access to existing content that the library already owns?
- Help users create new content or provide access?

The answer is to each of these questions is, “Yes!” Participants weren’t in total agreement on the factors that hold the greatest opportunity and promise for public libraries. Some valued unique collections, others valued “plugging in” to the collections of other organizations, and still others pointed to the opportunity of user-generated digital content. In all cases, it’s a matter of prioritizing, rather than closing off any possibilities. The greatest opportunity for one local public library may be different from another’s. Still, the vectors may provide insights on how to focus, who to partner with and where to begin.

Content owned and licensed: All public libraries have unique local materials—and if made accessible online, these materials may find new audiences and enhance their value in the community. Content may include things like government documents, genealogy vertical files, land journals, muster rolls, sheet music, employment records and so forth. The New York Public Library highlighted its growing collection of historical local restaurant menus, for example. Digitizing unique materials will make them even more accessible and valued. In one case, assessors’ records were made available and they went from having no use to being the most heavily used collection, due in part to all the information they can provide to those doing house histories. The global context should also be considered. As more countries are making their cultural heritage accessible, the rich cultural assets of the U.S. should be reflected in the emerging digital account of world culture.
Digital libraries are sometimes thought to be primarily for researchers, probably because academic libraries have been most active in this area. While a student may also be a researcher, young adults have needs and values that extend far beyond historical content. And every other group of users should be considered in terms of unmet needs and in bringing the material they currently use into the virtual realm. Potential users should also be considered: Their needs may be quite different and apparently are not currently being met. This is an opportunity to: repurpose content; make it meaningful to other segments of local communities; and to create a life curriculum.

While some were concerned about “books published yesterday,” many cited the need to ensure the ability to offer “the next novel.” Current books, including commercial e-books, is a category of content that is popular among public library users. Public library work largely revolves around dissemination of commercial content. It is the popular content that matters to most users rather than the more esoteric materials of interest to specialists. One participant suggested a need to work together to get vendors to sell e-books to libraries, rather than license them, and retain the same ability to purchase and lend that exists with physical books. While the markets, if left to their own devices, will eventually sort out current book and business models, participants in this meeting were mindful that libraries cannot rely on the market to represent public interests. The library’s brand is books and the public library role is to ensure that they are available to users in the forms they wish to use them. Many agreed that this is the most significant and immediate challenge public libraries face (see policy discussion in the “Navigate” section).

Content digitized and born digital: In choosing which analog materials to digitize, some participants in this discussion took the position that public libraries already selected the materials when they were added to the collection, and the assumption should be that these will be digitized and move the focus on to prioritizing content rather than selecting. Others posited that public libraries ought to be choosing content for its historical value, or community value. Those already digitizing may take this opportunity to reconcile multiple projects into coordinated, ongoing programs.

When digitizing, there’s no reason to start with the hardest materials, such as newspapers, which have myriad rights issues, in addition to being oversized and having articles broken up throughout a section. Starting with easier materials, the questions become: Who else is doing what? What is most needed? Where can the most value be found? Old public domain books may seem easy, but the digital library should be relevant to patrons, including digital natives. Digitizing out-of-print books may be questionable because most of the books will already be accessible through Google Books, Internet Archive and HathiTrust, so we’re likely to duplicate what’s been done. Furthermore,
out-of-print books are not of high use in public libraries.

Participants discussed “nonprint” digital content from photos, films and recordings, as well as library-created digital content and content that is born digital. This is a great opportunity to build out a collection that will be in high demand. It could include all of the above, user-created content and incorporating digital materials from another collection into our own. Denver Public Library provided compelling evidence that libraries should think about how user-created content could flow into a repository, if public libraries can provide help with standards and approaches to make it efficient and effective.

“Readers ought to be able to find stuff through lots of points of entry.”

Creating content and providing access: Public libraries without special collections can mix and reuse content from elsewhere, downloading materials of interest from others to build their local collections. Those with gaps can seek to fill them in by adding content from others’ collections. Libraries can create collections for their users, perhaps thematic groupings or materials organized around teacher requests. Users can also remix digital content to create their own content. Local history can be coordinated with current street views, giving a sense of everyday life in the area during a particular time period.

Public libraries often built strong collections of photos, maps and other local history content right up until the late 1990s when many of these types of materials began to be created in digital form. This is an opportunity to document our cities and ensure that recent history is accounted for.

Content developed for websites might also be included in the digital library. Consider that current day social justice issues are being played out on websites, blogs and tweets—things that may need to be captured to extend coverage to include current events. As an aside, the Los Angeles “Occupy” movement marched past the library and many attendees captured digital images. Will these images ever find their way into a public collection? As ever, libraries will play a role in assuring validation and accuracy, as well as access.

Users may enhance the content that is in the digital library and contribute new content to the digital library. Current content may also be captured via audio and video. The library often brings the world to local users; here local users can bring content to the library to share with the world.

The traditional view is that library collections consist of information that empowers the creation of new knowledge. Looking to library users and their evolving information needs will help inform how best to accomplish that goal.
Technology

Curation, content, creation...they all rely on technological solutions that we now know are temporary; better ways of doing things will always come along. So the first thing to accept is that whatever public libraries do, they will iterate on it, in order to continue to evolve. Trying to digitize at the highest possible quality, so that it would not have to be done again, may not be feasible. One suggested approach is to “digitize for access, preserve the original and digitize it again—if we need to.”

**Tools and equipment:** It’s important to think about what equipment is appropriate for a particular use (is it non-damaging, is it appropriate for the particular format of material, does it offer high enough quality, is it fast enough, is it supported and is training available?). The group explored a number of creative solutions that might help get libraries started. The idea of a “Scannabago,” an RV that is outfitted with good digitization equipment and skilled operators, might be helpful in getting libraries started on digitizing unique collections. On the other hand, having a $100 scanner and students scanning postcards or five volunteers with smartphone cameras ready to document downtown architecture is a start that might allow a small library to get a foot in the door, before its staff determine what they want to do next and how to do it. Public libraries may indeed need to act as tech shops for facilitating user contributions.

Tools will evolve, too. What is “good enough” today will seem inadequate tomorrow. Providing open code is one way to make it possible to rework tools for new, evolving functionality. And while many of the tools are being developed by academic libraries, open code makes it easier to adapt them for other purposes.

**Open, standard and interoperable:** Although the actual digitization can seem to be the trickiest part of the process, in fact it is often the metadata and interoperability that are more demanding. Digitization can be outsourced. Even if done in-house, it can be made routine for library staff to perform. Metadata requires some expertise, familiarity with the materials and familiarity with the standards. Although specific standards were not outlined explicitly during this gathering, an excerpt from “A Framework of Guidance for Building Good Digital Collections” is reprinted as an appendix to this document for reference.

There’s a proliferation of good-enough standards: libraries do well to select one and use it consistently, keeping in mind the end result.

Outsourcing can be the best solution in some cases; letting organizations that do a lot of digitization invest in the latest technology and keep their skills up-to-date. Scanning microfilm requires specialized equipment and there are many companies that can provide the service at a fraction of the cost of doing it in-house. Multimedia and conversion of full text may be other cases for outsourcing for expertise. When outsourcing, always know the goals, agree on quality standards and be cognizant of what may be lost in the transfer process.

The final goal is to make materials easily discoverable. Typically this means discoverable in an environment that libraries don’t control. Making metadata interoperable and harvestable is the best shot at “finding users.” An evolving way to make content more usable is to make the metadata available as open, linked data.

Small public libraries should not have to worry about architecture. They should be able to provide their content to a regional, state or other entity. For that reason, local libraries should adhere to the standards used by their collaborators. Then the collaborators can ensure that materials have persistent URLs, are interoperable, harvested and available as linked, open data. Whether the content is centralized, to what extent it is distributed, whether it lives
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in the cloud, and whether content is harvested or metadata with links is harvested will be decided at that level.

Library users should also influence these technological decisions. ADA compliance is increasingly mandated. People who do not have access to the latest technology should be considered, to avoid furthering the digital divide. The more ways users can be engaged as users, as contributors and as experts, the better. Libraries, working together, can develop solutions that provide access to all.

---

**According to the US Census...**

- 21 percent of people 16 and older with disabilities live in poverty, compared to 11 percent for those without a disability
- 72 percent of disabled people 16 and older aren’t working, compared to 27 percent of those without a disability
- The median income for the working disabled age 16 and up is $18,865; for those working without a disability, it is $28,983.


---

**Staff competencies**

A new role for the library ushers in new roles for librarians. Participants discussed this shift as a technology-related barrier, and focused on the need for staff training. Staff will be involved with selection, preparation, rights investigations, quality control and metadata creation.

It’s hard to work with what you’ve got when we may need new staffing models, workflows and relationships. Staff roles may need to be reassessed, and assistance may come from nontraditional sources (like code camps or “Scannabagos”). Some will be able to hire new staff, with new skills, to meet new needs.
Participants agreed: In any effort as expansive as a national digital library, clear, open communication among librarians and all the various partners, stakeholders, users and funders is a must-have. Specific concerns and ideas arose with regard to the roles various groups would play, and how best to include them in appropriate communications. Discussions centered around communications between and among: users, colleagues, decision-makers and library staff.

Users

User involvement is critical and getting the public on board, engaged and invested should be carefully considered. Many users already inhabit the digital world, and they don’t readily engage with their public libraries there. Educators need to know about resources and be comfortable using them in their classrooms. Friends groups and other special interest groups can be involved. Messages for education, advocacy, marketing and public outreach will all help increase awareness. Since changes will likely affect those who support libraries, they must be kept informed and involved. Many supporters would rally against closing their local library; that passion can be harnessed to do something new.

“Creating the cultural narrative can involve rural communities, like the redevelopment agencies of the 1960s. The fabric of a city can re-emerge with Japanese stories, African-American stories—all user-generated content. How can we engage users to be a part of this global fabric?”

Users can be encouraged to take part in crowd-sourcing, becoming part of the global fabric of library resources. A platform for public engagement could allow users to build virtual collections, develop user-generated content and use it as a cultural “Facebook.” In providing a context for collections, students and adults can rethink their community spaces, creating cultural narratives and reaching out to involve rural communities. Drawing people into interactive, participatory culture should be fun! It could allow the fabric of a city to re-emerge, better displaying the heritages of the many peoples who contributed to its development. A community creation center could connect to other groups—and to other digital materials—redefining the value libraries add to community-based outcomes.

Colleagues

Public library challenges are engaging because of public libraries’ close connection to the body politic. If rallied, public libraries can get leaders involved in setting the agenda for the digital library and ensuring meaningful public access. Education about the movement starts with those who are passionate about using technology to improve service. The vast majority of public libraries don’t know about national digital library plans. Reaching small libraries
and creating communities will help make everyone feel like they belong. In tough budget times, we need reassurance that they can work with what they’ve got, even as the digital ecosystem advances.

“In order to change policy, we need to speak with one voice.”

Getting public libraries on board requires a compelling response to “What’s in it for me?” Benefits, barriers, incentives and rewards should be identified...and they may be different for different sizes and types of public libraries. Librarians can spread the word, trickling down to librarians in the smallest towns. Because many public librarians don’t go to conferences, communicating through state librarians may be an excellent avenue.

**Decision-makers**

In order to justify funding, awareness of the different motivations of funding sources is necessary. Some public library funding comes from the county: so who, at that level, can share in these exciting opportunities? Civic engagement is key, so ask, “What is in high demand?” How can a library rationalize something new that is supplemental? The digital library should align with what funders think is important. Help them imagine some of the possibilities: new ways of connecting people to their town, new publics who may be served for the first time, and new content that may be contributed to the library’s collections.

**Library staff**

Library staff may be excited and scared. The administration should support this effort as an integral service and provide staff training on a constant basis to get them comfortable, ensuring that training goes beyond digital project staff. Don’t allow a culture war between traditional staff and innovative staff.

Help library staff create buzz with all involved parties. Libraries work within a political framework; library directors can be provided with talking points to use with legislators and other public decision-makers. Business and civic leaders can be enlisted in this cause. Elevator speeches need to be ready for a chance encounter with the mayor or city manager. This will likely be an organic, not a top-down, movement.

Practitioners and partners can be instrumental in creating, rolling out and supporting messages for the public, colleagues and library staff. Working together, public libraries and their partners can unite around the issues and the solutions in providing public access to digital content.

According to a comScore survey from December 2011, social networking is the leading online activity globally, accounting for 1 in every 5 online minutes.
In a summarizing session, participants called for a “map of the ecosystem” that public libraries are currently operating within, which could be used to advance awareness of the issues and strategic plans or priorities to address them. Based on a sketch of the ecosystem that was discussed during the meeting (see below), the map would include federal agencies, academic and research institution partners, commercial partners, library service agencies and cooperatives, existing organizations involved in digital public library or digital collections, and public libraries and their community stakeholders.

In many ways, the “information ecosystem” touches nearly every aspect of our modern lives. Participants focused their discussion, though, on the highest-priority directives that would help libraries:

- Keep costs down
- Explore new forms of revenue
- Develop new business models
- Keep an eye on policy issues
- Let go of the physical (and the outdated)
While a visual map of the ecosystem requires more detailed analysis of the plans and activities of all players, several themes were identified over the course of this two-day gathering. These themes represent a starting list of the considerations required to advance the work of building our digital future.

“Why pay taxes for public libraries if all this stuff is online? We need a better message. Libraries are providing more than ever before.”

Moving toward a long-term, sustainable digital public library can mean many things: funding current projects, ensuring the digital library endures into the future, best ways to use external funding and finding an acceptable lending model for e-books.

The group acknowledged that a digital public library may be seen as a threat to public libraries, by making physical libraries seem nonessential, making it easier to cut local library funding. Why pay taxes for public libraries if all this stuff is online? Some think that print books will be gone soon and wonder where that will leave libraries—as the next Borders? Some participants pointed to the New York Public Library and others experimenting by hosting “hacker spaces” and other nontraditional events in libraries, as some of their spaces are freed for use in new ways. Others are confident that print books are not disappearing; there is just a need to also accommodate new formats. No matter how much content is available in digital form, everyone agreed there is still a need for strong public libraries. But public libraries have to justify funding and remain relevant. And the best way to do that is to stay connected to users’ needs.

Keep costs down

One way to help sustain public libraries’ digital capacity is keeping costs down. Two or more libraries could share a tech person or a metadata expert. Libraries may choose to partner with a nearby university or a regional consortium. LYRASIS, for example, is working actively with its members to ensure that all library types and sizes can participate without taking on unreasonable local costs. There are other ways to lower costs: See if there is any open source software to help with digital preservation, collection development and management activities; if a library doesn’t have IT expertise, it can choose hosted solutions; consider centralized infrastructure. Not everyone can make tools, so use existing tools. Make use of Flickr and other free or nearly free services.

“We need a sustainable model for publishers and libraries, some kind of alternate compensation for authors and publishers, born out of collaboration and in concert with the law.”
But first make sure to identify user needs and work toward meeting them. Libraries have the public trust and need to protect it. Ensure that any investment in a digital library benefits the community. Not every library needs to be digitizing. Benefits, risks and opportunity costs all need to be considered.

Explore new forms of revenue

To meet technological needs, public libraries may be able to attract funding from new sources, but they should work to make sure that ongoing efforts are funded and scalable, and that this work will leverage expertise for ongoing work beyond the grant period.

There may be some ways to raise revenue. One library charges for digitization of another library’s collection and both keep the files. If one library gets funding for a high-end piece of equipment, perhaps it could provide scanning services to others for a fee, to help maintain it. Pooling resources among libraries may allow the creation of a shared digitization center. There are many ways to approach it.

Most libraries rely on grant funding, together with other available resources, to complete digital projects. But what is really needed is baseline funding in order to make participation in the digital library an ongoing activity. Staff and equipment need to be sustained, too. Grant projects also add to the existing workload—what is not going to get done, because staff are doing the grant-funded work? What shifts are necessary to attain project goals? Beware the one-time grant that enables the purchase of a top-of-the-line scanner. How will the annual support fee be paid? What if it needs repair? It’s important to plan for the benefits and costs beyond the grant period.

Learn about funding sources. Funders invest in new things, proven approaches and projects that bring disparate activities together. They like initiatives that are flexible and scalable. They want to be helpful and they recognize the need for investing in leadership. In many cases they would rather make a single major investment than smaller grants here and there. If a foundation will jump-start some of these efforts, others may join in to keep them going.

Develop new business models

Public libraries are in peril of losing the tradition of “free to all” to the publishers’ approach to e-lending. What is needed is a sustainable model for publishers and libraries, reasonable compensation for authors and publishers, born out of collaboration and in concert with the law.

Some warned that public libraries shouldn’t let the e-books challenge derail the entire digital library initiative. There’s urgency in that commercial entities and rights holders will sort out issues related to current books, with or without libraries. The profession should be there, representing the public good.

Until recently, publishers sold books and libraries bought and loaned them. Publishers now want to license books to libraries and limit the number of circulations, creating an industry “stranglehold” on e-book distribution. Like Amazon, they could track usage, sales and reviews to leverage their platform for their use. Some believe that public libraries should be able to buy and lend new e-books (with each loan expiring after a set period, but with no limit on the number of sequential loans). Libraries need agreement from publishers to honor e-book copyright in the same way they do for physical books. Publishers are sensitive to new inroads in their business model; they are especially concerned about being disintermediated and losing their authors to self-publishing. Any new arrangement should benefit all parties involved.

Participants championed the idea that libraries should proactively engage publishers, assuring them that public libraries intend to compensate them for the content they will provide. While access to a national digital library may be free to the end user, there will likely be payments behind the scenes for in-copyright content. Sorting out the lending of e-books is not the only challenge. Audio and video are already being incorporated into some new “books” that are
more like networked objects with live content, more akin to dramatically enriched websites than to traditional books.

Libraries, like publishers, are invested in analog models. Libraries face fundamental changes to staff roles, management and culture. As they learn new skills, staff can begin to figure out who is best-suited to the new endeavors. It may be more like a revolution than making incremental adjustments to existing approaches. How would a digital library look if started from scratch? While some fear that the digital library will render the library as we know it moot, it may actually increase the demand for library services—as long as those services remain relevant to users. So, for the foreseeable future, the physical library and the virtual library must be actively managed.

Keep an eye on policy issues

Navigating through a complex information ecosystem requires a consideration of the many different policy issues to be explored; just a few were discussed in this meeting and are highlighted here.

**Copyright:** Copyright issues complicate efforts to make some materials accessible in the digital library, so there was significant discussion on the topic throughout the meeting. In fact, it can be so complicated that some libraries choose to avoid the issues altogether. Public library leaders urged one another not to let copyright concerns be the reason to not start digitizing. Instead, they suggested that public libraries approach copyright issues with a desire to understand the issues, honor the intention of the law and come up with a practical application of the policies.

Participants agreed that public libraries should develop and adopt enabling policies and practices, and that most current policies predate digital. Librarians can be active participants in the current discourse about copyright in the digital age.

**Privacy:** Similarly, privacy is a multifaceted issue. It involves both the privacy of those depicted in our collections and the privacy of those using our collections. Privacy is a core value to libraries and libraries are traditionally trusted protectors of privacy. Public libraries should bring these values into the digital realm, even while they may be harder to manage there. The content captured through social media may be riddled with privacy issues. Obtaining meaningful consent to collect user data is difficult, but may be a case where libraries can take the lead in community conversations.

**Fees and lending:** Some libraries may wish to retain the right to charge for commercial uses of their local digitized content, or for higher quality versions than are made available online. In one case, a public library funded two staff positions by making higher resolution photographs available for purchase. Value-added access for a fee is something many are willing to consider—especially to recoup staff time and cover the costs of materials. Still, the group grappled with a number of questions: Should the movie studio be charged to use footage? Charge the press for use of historical materials? Charge the ad agency for use of an image?

Content “created by taxpayer dollars,” many agreed, should be used for the public good, and to support creativity.
and new uses. If openness spawns innovation, perhaps digital content should be completely free to all. Deciding who pays and who doesn’t can lead to another category of have-nots.

The most immediate issue right now, many agreed, is that of lending digital books. This discussion raised questions like: What if libraries buy, instead of license, an e-book? Libraries can lend software; can’t that be extended to the lending of e-books? Why shouldn’t libraries be able to lend one copy at a time as they currently do? The trick, some said, is getting rights holders to agree to that approach. While operating without a national policy or strategy, public libraries, nevertheless, should not let publishers alone define the national policy.

“Should we scan and destroy or keep the original as a source? We can’t live in both worlds forever.”

Let go of the physical (and the outdated)

What materials can a public library discard once they’ve been digitized? Public libraries destroyed newspapers when they were microfilmed, but there may be more at risk with digitization. Some argue for “keeping everything” so that in case of questions about the integrity of the digitized version or to establish the custody chain if subpoenaed, the original is available for recourse. Libraries could, however, send originals to cheaper storage. The group acknowledged that operating in dual worlds can’t go on forever, but retaining unique materials and books that are not widely held is certainly prudent.

In addition to letting go of content, public libraries may need to let go of other roles and activities as well. As the possibilities and responsibilities of the digital library become clear, new activities will require attention and resources; some suggested that public libraries should work together to identify and formalize some of the things that could be stopped.

“We need to justify how we allocate resources to this. There won’t be any more funding; we need to do more with the funding we have. One way is to stop maintaining legacy systems.”
Collaborate radically

Success in the digital library ecosystem will be driven by collaboration. If everyone has to learn by doing, there will be no efficiencies of scale and libraries won’t get there fast enough. Participants will need to **work with other libraries** as well as with **library supporters and service providers**. The viewpoints of **practitioners and partners** in other professions and industries will also need to be taken into account, as will efforts being advanced toward a **global digital library**.

**Working with other libraries**

Those who don’t need help will be offering it, reducing barriers to entry. Small libraries can enter slowly. They don’t need a digitization lab if they can partner with someone who has one. They don’t need servers and storage if they can use a hosted content management system. They don’t need to have their own website if they can use a state or regional or even national website. Once they are involved, they may develop expertise they can share with others. Of course, some small libraries are already active players; some large libraries are new entrants, but no one has to go it alone.

Consortia are great for leveraging economies of scale. For example, the LYRASIS Mass Digitization Collaborative has been helping libraries digitize books and newspapers and is beginning to work with special collections. Outsourcing to a service provider usually means lower costs, better equipment and extensive expertise. Another approach is that of the Digital Commonwealth, a Massachusetts statewide harvesting site that also offers storage.

“We can’t use the old model of collaboration. With digital, it has to be different. We may have to give up some independence to standardization.”

Having a visiting metadata librarian spend some time on-site can be more beneficial than sending staff to workshops, since he or she will be able to address specific, local challenges. To reach small libraries with few staff and little IT support, libraries may be able to take advantage of Scannabagos that roll up, digitize a collection and then roll on to the next stop. Consortia can help by mentoring and finding capable partners. Web services and mobile apps can be created by those who can and used by many.

Collaboration should transcend differences. Not all libraries need to digitize their own content. Librarians can talk with colleagues about other options and best costs available for their needs. They should focus on partnering. Those with scanning labs can work with other libraries to get grants that offset the costs to digitize content. These labs can be partnership hubs, with libraries supporting the labs that support them. Not every library is prepared to preserve
digitized content or to manage born-digital content. Public libraries may look to academic library partners who deal with those issues every day.

As an example of statewide collaboration, the California State Library directs and administers LSTA funding. The Califa Library Group coordinates project management. CONTENTdm is used to manage digital collections. Metadata is outsourced to Infopeople. The California Digital Library (CDL) provides the infrastructure. Is there a way to replicate this in other states?

Working with library supporters and service providers

The challenges of the digital age invite new opportunity for collaborative solutions.

Libraries may benefit from interaction with human-computer interface designers, coders, infrastructure experts and standards mavens. Find ways to engage them in the local library and community. Host a ‘hackathon’ or a ‘makerspace’ to bring in community outliers. Think about how state Centers for the Book might get involved. Attend conferences and workshops to get a broader perspective and to meet other potential collaborators.

Collaboration needs to benefit both parties. So if one is doing all the heavy lifting, it should be compensated in some way, sometimes for a fee, sometimes for some other quid pro quo, like being allowed to include the digitized content in its collections. Libraries should challenge themselves to not just benefit from someone else’s expertise but make sure some of it becomes resident in local staff.

Collaboration on access is particularly important. Materials need to be discoverable in as many ways as possible. Libraries can’t just create local silos, but need content to appear in aggregations and in Google searches. Leverage resources through collaboration with organizations like Internet Archive and OCLC to push the access envelope.

Collaboration isn’t easy. Sometimes it’s very complicated, involving contracts, standards and quality control requirements. One of the challenges is retaining local identity and not just disappearing into a larger effort. Libraries can establish an imprint, a digital identity, for local materials. Incentives for all parties in a collaboration are needed, aligned to their motivations and needs. The vision is bigger than any one entity, but no library is too small to have a voice.

Practitioners and partners

Different organizations have different related roles that support the “ecosystem” in which public libraries operate. Many potential partners were identified as important to the digital future and the “life cycle of digitization.”

Perhaps the most essential participants are those with the content. Public libraries have an important role to play in selecting and describing content, but key to that role are the creators, publishers and other rights holders of the content currently in our custody.

Second to the content providers are those with the skills required to provide access, from the regional, state and national aggregators, to Google and other search services that users are likely to prefer.

In between are the organizers, the digitizers, the preservers, the tool builders and the funders—the philanthropists and foundations that get these efforts going and the public officials who approve, fund and sustain ongoing library programs.

The DPLA (http://dp.la) and other digital libraries

The Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) is an umbrella organization for those wanting to be involved in creating a national digital library. It’s a nascent initiative addressing questions and setting an agenda for
moving forward. This brief summary contains some aspects that are relevant to the public library movement.

The DPLA brings together different viewpoints, experiences and collections, working with technical experts and private industry to find solutions to complex challenges. There are five elements to the DPLA: community, content, metadata, code, and tools and services. Tools and services, especially, will go a long way toward helping public libraries with little funding to take part.

To address all of the challenges involved in creating a national digital library, there are six “workstreams” for focused effort: Audience & Participation, Content & Scope, Financial/Business Models, Governance, Legal Issues and Technical Aspects. A core principle of the DPLA is that the digital library will be made freely available to users. DPLA is anxious for public libraries to be involved and is committed to better articulating the benefits to public libraries. It wants to engage the public library community as contributors and users, and to help shape the plans.

Some public libraries worry that the DPLA will require them to adhere to DPLA standards, when the public library may have had successful digital library efforts underway for some time. The key is interoperability. If a library uses one standard consistently, it should be able to interoperate through crosswalks or data mapping. The benefits of participation will outweigh any requirements.

DPLA will also help state organizations with linked data and expertise in how to realize its benefits; this may be the approach that finally makes linked, open data accessible and useful for libraries and their users. And the global digital library is likely to be stitched together with linked, open data.

While the digital library will be free to users, there are costs to participating libraries, perhaps relative to a library’s monograph collection size. DPLA has received generous planning support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and it is anticipated that other funding bodies will join the effort. In order to affect funding and policy, the library community needs to coalesce around a national strategy. The DPLA has the potential to be that strategy. Public libraries have a unique role in their communities and unique assets as agents of the public interest that should guide the development of the DPLA.

To get involved, public libraries can attend plenary meetings, follow the DPLA wiki and sign up for the listserv—but the important work will be done in the workstreams. Librarians can sign up for one or more and get involved.

**HathiTrust** ([www.hathitrust.org](http://www.hathitrust.org))

HathiTrust is also a “bold idea with big plans.” HathiTrust is a partnership of major research institutions and libraries working to ensure that the cultural record is preserved and accessible long into the future. There are more than 60 partners in HathiTrust, and membership is open to institutions worldwide. At this writing, HathiTrust had digitized more than 10 million volumes, about 28% of which are in the public domain.
The Internet Archive (www.archive.org)

The Internet Archive is a nonprofit organization founded to build an Internet library. Its purposes include offering permanent access for researchers, historians, scholars, people with disabilities and the general public to historical collections that exist in digital format. Founded in 1996, the Internet Archive includes texts, audio, moving images and software, as well as archived Web pages, and provides specialized services for adaptive reading and information access for the blind and other persons with disabilities.

“Consortia are key to leveraging economies of scale and reducing the barrier to entry for smaller organizations.”

Library service organizations

Globally, library service organizations can aggregate digital content and share expertise. OCLC’s WorldCat database is a focal point for content, aggregating information about libraries’ digital collections. LYRASIS is an organization that can help libraries of any size realize economies of scale for their digital projects by working within a network. With organizations like Digital Library Federation, practitioners can get together and develop shareable tools for use at a national level. At the state level, funding can be rationalized to build capacity. At the regional level, services like scanning labs and federated search engines can be provided. Libraries should engage and collaborate with broader communities of collecting organizations to address common challenges, like rights issues.

Librarians can talk to state librarians about putting together new statewide plans and about the importance of these initiatives. Public librarians can describe the impact this could make—and be able to demonstrate impact once some of the goals are reached.

Working toward a global digital library

The national digital library is a part of a global digital library, too, so DPLA is looking at other efforts outside the US. DPLA has entered into a partnership with the European Union digital library, Europeana (www.europeana.eu). They have identified common principles and DPLA will try to build on what Europeana has done, moving the cart forward instead of reinventing the wheel. It is likely DPLA will use the Europeana data model, which would facilitate making the content interoperable, and there are plans to take part in a collaborative content development initiative that focuses on immigration; the flow of people becomes a flow of information.

Aligning public library interests with DPLA and other initiatives will prevent duplication of effort and will create unified results. Working alone, public libraries would have to find funding and an organizing entity, and agree on priorities. There are many different strategies and approaches, as well as different levels of development among public libraries—all have a place in DPLA.

Joining a larger effort will allow work in multiple directions. The various and sometimes conflicting voices among public librarians can all be represented through the DPLA workstreams and other communication vehicles.
A call to action: grab a shovel

This discussion challenged public library leaders to join colleagues and partners in creating a future for public library service, together. By the end of the meeting, participants shared words of wisdom and inspiration for taking the next steps. A number of suggestions for public libraries emerged from the final discussion, and they are all things that public library leaders, regardless of role, can start doing today. Together, they may form the basis of an action plan that public libraries can take to advance their digital futures:

Create the digital content experience

- **Define your digital strategy:** Think about what you can uniquely contribute; link or mix these with local, regional and national initiatives; use standards consistently to enable interoperability.
- **Get licensed content in the mix:** Temper the urge to include historical collections when current commercial content makes up 80% of use.
- **Make local contributions to a global effort:** Select where, along the “digital content vectors,” your library will focus efforts and resources. Through interoperability and open data, ensure that efforts can be shared for everyone’s benefit.
- **Start creating content:** Digitize and share what you can; reinvent roles; spur feet on the ground; invite patrons to post their pictures in collections on Flickr; work with state libraries to update the five-year-plans.
- **Keep learning:** The environment, tools and techniques will be constantly changing; keep changing with them.
Communicate openly

- **Educate and communicate with colleagues:** Consider the target audiences public libraries need to reach with a message about the urgency and importance of public access to digital content; create and advance these messages for influence on multiple stakeholders.

- **Advocate for users and communities:** Be informed and engaged with users in the digital space; ensure free access to digital content and free access to the tools and platforms that allow digital content creation and augmentation; ensure your library uses Web-based communications channels such as social networking, seeing that users spend a large portion of their online time using these services.

- **Educate and communicate with colleagues:** Be informed and be engaged; develop talking points to get others involved; develop case studies of public libraries and public library partnerships that can be considered “best practices”; be an apostle or a convener.

Navigate the ecosystem

- **Map the ecosystem:** Based on many of the considerations posed throughout this document, public libraries should complete the “map of the ecosystem” that was started by this convening and its accompanying national survey. Many participants favored this approach over “creating a blueprint.”

- **Influence policies:** Lend your voice to developing copyright, privacy and lending policies that will otherwise be determined without input from public library leaders; advance copyright policy for the digital age in ways that serve both public and commercial interests; identify whether privacy policies are an obstacle or asset in advancing library participation in our digital future.

- **Create new business models:** Advance the discourse on new revenue options or models for public libraries, especially as they relate to digital services; buy instead of license to show publishers that lending grows the market for books; invite all interested parties (and potential partners) to the table; identify sustainable models for digital libraries beyond philanthropic support; align public interests with commercial interests and preserve the library’s role.

- **Prioritize library services and streamline operations:** Stop doing something so that you will have more resources for your library to advance new activities; allocate resources in your public library to ensure that the costs of providing access to digital content remain reasonable.
Collaborate radically

- **Aggregate:** Ensure that diverse efforts and the digital content that will emerge from them are coordinated into a single “national digital public library”; identify how your public library will engage with practitioners and partners on your priority initiatives.

- **Join collaborative networks:** Collaborate with a variety of partners and efforts; identify benefits, barriers and rewards of participation.

- **Synchronize:** Identify all mechanisms for coordinating efforts across the digital ecosystem; join a DPLA workstream; identify whether the DPLA is the overarching initiative under which all digital service strategies and activities take place; consider what other organizations need to be “on the map.”

- **Surface additional assets:** Identify and share with others any additional “players in the ecosystem” who may influence public library awareness and planning of public library digital strategies.

- **Engage users and communities:** Educate the public about the issues, and get them involved in the discussions; ensure that a national digital library has content and tools that really matter to public library users; ensure that a national digital public library, and a global digital library, are inclusive, and don’t create a new divide.

Wherever public library leaders choose to engage in this discussion, and in building the future of public libraries in a digital age, their contributions will be valuable. The communities that public libraries serve are counting on this work to make sure that unique digital collections can be easily created and broadly shared, and that access to digital content is free to all.

Public library leaders and partners agreed:

“If public libraries fail to create and implement digital strategies, communities will become more deeply divided—between those who have the opportunity to participate in culture, civics, the workforce and nearly every other aspect of American life, and those who do not.”

They also pointed to the need for public libraries to develop a shared vision of our digital future, and to create an agenda, strategy and next steps that they can work on together.

The “call to action” items suggested by the participants in this meeting can form the start of a concerted, coordinated effort to ensure that we meet the community’s needs, and continue to fulfill the role of ensuring equal access to knowledge and opportunity.

For more information and to get involved, visit: [oclc.org/go/our-digital-future](http://oclc.org/go/our-digital-future).
In the few months following the Los Angeles meeting, and while the organizers of the meeting worked to publish the outcomes in this document, the public library community surfaced a major policy concern regarding publisher restrictions on the acquisition of current e-books. This policy concern was ignited by a major publisher announcement to impose licensing restrictions on the number of times that a public library could circulate an “e-book” before a new “copy” had to be acquired by the lending library. This was followed by an announcement from Amazon that it had entered the book lending business, only to be followed by an announcement by OverDrive, a major library industry e-book wholesaler, that several major publishers were planning to limit certain titles to public libraries through this distributor. As the publishing industry searches for a new business model in the rapidly evolving digital environment, it is clear that the public library, an institution that has functioned as a taxpayer-supported public access channel for books, is being squeezed out of our digital future.

In reaction, a handful of public libraries, most notably Douglas County in Colorado and the NYPL/Boston consortium, are looking for new lending strategies for e-content. These strategies may surface new models that can be scaled more broadly, but a national remedy remains elusive.

The Digital Public Library of America (www.dp.la.org), meanwhile, is working to build a structure and set of relationships that will enable libraries of all types across the United States to participate in the creation of a national digital public library. The work of the DPLA that is being supported by private foundation funding is scheduled for completion in early 2013. If successful, the DPLA has the potential for becoming the digital backbone for all US libraries to make their digital collections more widely accessible. All DPLA activities are open to any interested party and public library participation is actively being sought.

Also, at the March Public Library Association (PLA) conference in Philadelphia, the American Library Association (ALA) announced that it had “advanced the goal of enabling library access to e-books to everyone in America’s communities.” Sari Feldman, co-chair of ALA’s Digital Content and Libraries Working Group (and Executive Director of the Cuyahoga County Public Library in Ohio), acknowledged the serious concerns about e-books expressed by PLA and other ALA members during the opening session, and provided an update on the progress of the Working Group. ALA and PLA leaders “met with distributors in Philadelphia in the same way we met with publishers in New York in January,” including the senior leaders of OverDrive, Baker & Taylor, Ingram and 3M.

But will these ongoing activities be enough? Will they be timely? Although a clear, focused plan or suggested priority did not come out of the Los Angeles meeting, attendees did leave with a sense of urgency and concern that without rapid development of such a plan, public libraries risk falling further behind. Unless immediate national collective attention is given to the role of the public library in the digital age, the public library, as we know it, will lose its ability to provide the public access to e-books and other digital content in the same way it has historically provided access to those same materials in print formats.

In order to more quickly advance a resolution to these issues, Martín Gómez, in his former role as General Manager and City Librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library, joined Patrick Losinski, Chief Executive Officer of the Columbus
Metropolitan Library, in developing “A Strategy for Securing Public Access to Digital Content.” This white paper was reviewed by a handful of public library directors and is available at ndpl.lapl.org.

In the paper, Gómez and Losinski outlined four areas for immediate attention by the public library community:

1. Develop strategies to ensure that public libraries will continue to provide public access to commercially produced digital content
2. Position public libraries as public repositories for and archival hosts of content that is born digital, including efforts in support of community digital literacy and inclusion
3. Ensure that the general public has access to historic and unique content owned by public libraries, museums and other cultural heritage institutions
4. Increase public library awareness of and participation in national and international book digitization projects, including efforts to create resource sharing mechanisms and infrastructure.

In their paper, they state:

The Los Angeles meeting validated the work of many digital initiatives that have emerged over the past several years. It produced a number of themes by which public libraries can begin to organize their concerns, and prioritize their activities and resources. In a celebration of the things we have accomplished, one comment made near the conclusion of the meeting was that we have “moved from collection development to prioritization”—suggesting that everything needs to be digitized.

In time, perhaps so. But the public library profession has immediate digital/e-book policy matters that have been understated and neglected. And so, we suggest urgent, concerted attention on the first area, and call on you for support in this effort.

Gómez and Losinski argue that public library leadership must find a way to champion and heighten the awareness of this emerging public policy matter in the digital sphere. But they acknowledge that the solution on how to drive to the best public interest outcomes remains open for debate. In order to further explore this issue, they propose creating a temporary project fund to focus on this public policy matter on a full-time basis that will benefit all public libraries and the users we represent.

Gómez and Losinski hope to gather sufficient resources to focus attention on what they've identified as one of the most important issues facing the future of the public library. Funding would be used to jump-start a public policy initiative that would:

- Champion the access rights of the customers we serve
- Demonstrate examples of new and emergent roles of public libraries in the new digital environment
- Create a strategy for greater public library integration and resource sharing in the digital realm
- Preserve the fundamental role that public libraries play in a democracy.

This document is intended to provide even greater impetus to the urgent conversation that must engage even more public library leaders across the country. Our hope is that readers will engage locally and nationally through their libraries, groups, associations and civic organizations. If you would like more information about this important initiative to continue the work, please contact Pat Losinski (plosinski@columbuslibrary.org) or Martín Gómez (martin.gomez@usc.edu).
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Meeting agenda

Creating a Blueprint for Building a National Digital Public Library

November 15–17, 2011

Los Angeles Public Library, Richard J. Riordan Central Library

DAY 1

○ Welcome from Martín Gómez, City Librarian, Los Angeles Public Library
○ Greetings from Aileen Adams, Deputy Mayor, City of Los Angeles
○ Remarks by Susan Hildreth, Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
○ Keynote Presentation – John Palfrey, Henry N. Ess Professor of Law and Vice Dean for Library and Information Resources at Harvard Law School

DAY 2

○ Welcome and Overview for the Day – Martín Gómez
○ Panel 1: Digitizing the Public Library – Issues, Challenges and Successes
  1. Moderator – Stacey Aldrich, California State Librarian
  2. The State of Digitization in Public Libraries – Carol Linn, Linn & Logan, Project Consultant
  3. Economics of Digitization – Robin Dale, LYRASIS
  4. Policy – Mary Minow, librarylaw.com
  5. Content, Applications and the End User – Jamie Seemiller, Denver Public Library
  6. Technology – Tom Blake, Boston Public Library

○ Panel 2 – Academic and Research Library Projects – Overview and Lessons Learned
  1. Moderator – Catherine Quinlan, University of Southern California
  2. Yale University – Meg Bellinger, Office of Digital Assets and Infrastructure
  3. New York Public Library – Ben Vershbow
  4. California Digital Library – Laine Farley

○ Invitational Lunch, Facilitated Panel Discussion with DPLA Public Library Steering Committee, where participants will focus on the role of public libraries in the DPLA, ideas for greater inclusion in the public library community and next steps
  1. Facilitator – Peggy Rudd, Texas State Librarian
  2. San Francisco Public Library – Luis Herrera, City Librarian
  3. Director of the Digital Public Library of America Secretariat – Maura Marx
  4. IMLS – Susan Hildreth, Director
Panel 3 – National Support for Building and Sustaining the Digital Library

1. Moderator – Emily Gore, Florida State University
2. Open Knowledge Commons/DPLA – Maura Marx
3. Digital Library Federation (CLIR) – Rachel Frick
4. OCLC – Chip Nilges
5. HathiTrust – Jeremy York
6. Internet Archive – Peter Brantley

Panel 4 – Roundtable Discussion – Reaction to Public Library Participation in Creating a National Digital Public Library

1. Moderator – Linda Crowe, Peninsula Library Network
2. LYRASIS – Robin Dale
3. St. Louis Public Library – Waller McGuire
4. Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County – Kim Fender
5. State Library of North Carolina – Amy Rudersdorf
6. Los Angeles Public Library – Giovanna Mannino
7. Columbus Metropolitan Library – Patrick Losinski

Expectations for Thursday – Martín Gómez

Day 3

Welcome & Remarks by Ken Brecher, President of the Library Foundation of Los Angeles

Summary of discussion thus far – Cathy De Rosa, Vice President for the Americas and Global Vice President of Marketing, OCLC

Work session on drafting the blueprint, led by Gary E. Strong

This session is aimed at getting all public librarians in attendance involved in shaping the future role of public libraries in the creation of a national digital public library. The session will build on the presentations and discussions from the previous sessions, and the anticipated outcomes include:

1. Identification of areas of need for public and private investment to help public libraries
2. List of possible future projects
3. Strategies for collaboration and future partnerships
4. Policy or operational barriers
5. Outline of next steps

Wrap-up – Martín Gómez
Speaker bios

Stacey Aldrich, California State Library: Stacey Aldrich was appointed State Librarian of California by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on November 19, 2009 after serving as Acting State Librarian since February 2009; she also was appointed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger to serve as Deputy State Librarian and did so beginning in August 2007. As State Librarian, she directs a staff of 155, oversees a budget of about $54 million, and works with state and local officials to develop innovative programming that supports the success of communities through libraries. Prior to joining the State Library, she served as Assistant Director of the Omaha Public Library from 2005–2007, Branch Chief of Public Libraries and State Networking for the Maryland State Department of Education from 1996–1999, and 2000–2005, and as Senior Associate at Coates & Jarratt, Inc., a futuring think tank, in 2000. She served as Information Technology Librarian for Hood College Library in Frederick, Maryland, from 1992–1996. Stacey earned an MA in library science and a BA in Russian language and literature from the University of Pittsburgh. She has served as a board member for the Association of Professional Futurists. Library Journal named her one of the library profession’s Movers & Shakers in 2003. An engaging futurist, speaker and workshop facilitator, Stacey challenges librarians to envision and actively shape the future of libraries.

Meg Bellinger, Yale University: Meg Bellinger is Director of the Office of Digital Assets and Infrastructure, Yale University. The Office of Digital Assets and Infrastructure (ODAI) was created in the fall of 2008 to provide strategic and operational leadership for the development of the University’s digital assets and asset management infrastructure and Meg is its first director. Meg holds a key leadership and coordination function that guides and facilitates collaboration among the library, museums, other campus content repositories and Information Technology Services to develop a University-wide digital information management strategy with defined standards, policies and implementation plans. Prior to her appointment, Meg was Associate University Librarian for Integrated Library Systems and Technical Services in the Yale University Library. Before coming to Yale, Meg was Vice President for Digital and Preservation Resources, where she created a new business division at OCLC Online Computer Library Center.

Tom Blake, Boston Public Library: Tom Blake has been working at the Boston Public Library as its Digital Imaging Production Manager and Digital Projects Manager since October 2005. He is currently responsible for the creation of beautiful, versatile and sustainable digital objects for all BPL digital initiatives. Tom came to the Library from the Massachusetts Historical Society, where he was involved in several digital projects, including the online version of the diaries of John Quincy Adams. He also served as a photographer and imaging specialist for nine years at Boston Photo Imaging, and as an archives assistant at the MIT Special Collections and Archives. Tom holds a BFA in professional photographic illustration from the Rochester Institute of Technology, and an MS in library and information science with a concentration in archives management from Simmons College.

Peter Brantley, Internet Archive: Peter Brantley is the Director of the BookServer Project at the Internet Archive, a San Francisco-based not-for-profit library. He is the convener of the Books in Browsers conference for the Internet Archive and O’Reilly Media, which considers blue-sky futures for reading and the book. He was previously the Director of the Digital Library Federation, a nonprofit association of research and national libraries. He serves as a contributing editor for Publishers Weekly, writing on libraries and copyright. With colleagues in the open software community, he has been coordinating the development and adoption of the Open Publication Distribution System (OPDS), and helping to spearhead standards in bookmarking and annotations with NISO.

Kenneth S. Brecher, Library Foundation of Los Angeles: Kenneth S. Brecher is the President of the Library Foundation of Los Angeles. He was formerly the Executive Director of the Sundance Institute, and has also served as President of the William Penn Foundation in Philadelphia. He has been the Director of the Boston Children’s Museum, and Associate Artistic Director of the Mark Taper Forum in Los Angeles. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University and is an honors graduate of Cornell University. An anthropologist by training, Mr. Brecher has been the recipient of numerous fellowships, including a research grant from the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and a Ford Foundation Fellowship for his study of Amazonian tribesmen in Brazil. He serves on a number of boards and is a Trustee of the Wildwood School in Los Angeles. He is a member of the International Arts Advisory Council for the...
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Wexner Center for the Arts, served as Chair of the Lillian and Dorothy Gish Prize and is on the Committee of Selection for the Rhodes Scholarships. Mr. Brecher has lectured and published widely and has served as an international consultant on current challenges facing arts leadership. He is the author of *Too Sad to Sing, A Memoir with Postcards*, published by Harcourt, and edited the classic work, *Xingu: The Indians and Their Myths*, by the legendary Brazilian brothers Orlando and Claudio Villas Boas. His installation, “The Little Room of Epiphanies,” was at the Santa Monica Museum of Art in 2006.

**Linda Crowe, Pacific Library Partnership:** Linda Crowe is Chief Executive Officer of the Pacific Library Partnership that includes the public libraries in Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties. She is also the Executive Director of The Califa Group that provides 220 libraries in California with the opportunity to cooperatively purchase services and participate in programs at the best possible price. Last year Ms. Crowe was Co-Chair of the Equal Access for Electronic Resources Committee (EQUACC), an ALA Presidential Committee, and she is currently a member of the OITP E Book Committee.

**Robin L. Dale, LYRASIS:** Robin L. Dale is the Director of Digital & Preservation Services for LYRASIS. In that position, she works with a fabulous set of staff to develop and offer preservation, digitization and digital preservation opportunities for cultural heritage organizations. In addition to designing LYRASIS’ education and training opportunities around these topics, she also directs the LYRASIS Mass Digitization Collaborative, an effort to help member organizations digitize their content and make it publicly accessible. Additionally, she manages the LYRASIS NEH-funded Preservation Field Services program that focuses on professional development and developing regional disaster preparedness and response programs. She is also a convening member of the Digital Public Library of America’s Content and Scope Workstream. Before joining LYRASIS, Robin was the Associate University Librarian for Collections and Library Information Systems at the University of California, Santa Cruz, where she coordinated UCSC’s participation in mass digitization projects, and worked with her staff to formulate the digitization and digital collection development of local, unique collections like the Grateful Dead Archive. Prior to UCSC, she was a long-time program manager at RLG, managing collaborative programmatic activities related to digital preservation and digitization, and served as the Project Director of the CRL Auditing and Certification of Digital Archives project.

**Cathy De Rosa, OCLC:** Cathy De Rosa is Vice President for the Americas and Global Vice President of Marketing. She joined OCLC in 2001 and is responsible for marketing, library services and support, and library advocacy programs. She also leads library market research initiatives for OCLC. Ms. De Rosa was the principal contributor to the 2003 *OCLC Environmental Scan: Pattern Recognition*, the first of several international studies that report on library use, perceptions and brand recognition in the age of the Internet-savvy information consumer. She and her team have also published extensively on library advocacy, including *From Awareness to Funding* for U.S. public libraries, *How Libraries Stack Up*, and more recently, *Perceptions of Libraries 2010*. Ms. De Rosa has 25 years of experience in marketing and communications, new product deployment and marketing education. Prior to joining OCLC, she served on the faculty of the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University, where she taught on subjects in marketing and branding. Ms. De Rosa has also held management and executive management positions at Symix Systems, Price Waterhouse and Texas Instruments.

**Laine Farley, California Digital Library:** Laine Farley is Executive Director, California Digital Library, University of California. Laine has been with the CDL since its inception in 1997 and assumed the position of Executive Director in 2008. Previously, her roles at the CDL have included positions as Director of Digital Library Services and Deputy University Librarian. In addition, she was the user services coordinator and the coordinator of bibliographic policy and services at the UC Division of Library Automation. She has also been a reference librarian and coordinator of bibliographic instruction at UC Riverside, and head of the humanities department at the Steen Library at Stephen F. Austin State University. Throughout her career, Laine has worked on a wide range of projects involving bibliographic database design, user interface design, cataloging theory and practice, interlibrary loan processes and standards, government information, digital images and archival finding aids. Laine has a special interest in identifying emerging service needs in support of scholarship in a digital realm, and developing innovative solutions that blend traditional and new service environments. She holds MLS and BA degrees from the University of Texas at Austin.
Kim Fender, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County: Kim Fender has served as Executive Director of the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County since 1999. She was formerly Assistant to the Director and Head, Information Systems. Ms. Fender received her MLS from the University of Kentucky in 1983. She was awarded a graduate internship at the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, and accepted a position as a reference librarian at the Boone County Public Library upon completing her MLS degree. She also served as Head of Public Services at Campbell County Public Library, and as Manager of Information Services at ATE Management and Services Company, before beginning employment with the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County in 1988 as a Librarian in the Institutions/Books-by-Mail Department. In 1993 she was appointed Librarian, Deputy Librarian’s Office—Main Library Services. She was then promoted to Assistant to the Director in 1995 and was named Head, Information Systems in 1998. Ms. Fender currently serves on the Success by 6 Steering Council, the Cincinnati State Workforce Development Center Advisory Board, the Ohio Library Council’s Nominating Committee, the Girl Scouts of Kentucky’s Wilderness Road Council Board, and the Leadership Cincinnati Steering Committee, and she chairs the Ohio Library Council’s Government Relations Committee. She is a past-president of the Greater Cincinnati Library Consortium Board and the Ohio Public Library Information Network Board. Ms. Fender is an alumna of Leadership Cincinnati. She has been named a 2011 Woman of Distinction by the Girls Scouts of Western Ohio and was profiled in the Cincinnati Edition of the Women’s Book. In 2009 she was named Librarian of the Year by the Ohio Library Council, and in 2008 the Cincinnati-Hamilton County Community Action Agency honored her with a Bridge Builder Award. In 2001 she received the University of Kentucky School of Library and Information Science Alumni Association Outstanding Alumna Award and in 1999 was honored with a Professional Achievement Award from Northern Kentucky University.

Rachel L. Frick, Council on Library and Information Resources: Rachel L. Frick is the Director of the Digital Library Federation Program at the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR/DF). Prior to her work at CLIR, she was the Senior Program Officer for the National Leadership Grants Program for Libraries at the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Her library experiences ranged from being the Director of Bibliographic and Digital Services at the University of Richmond to a regional sales manager for the Faxon Company, with a variety of library positions in between. She holds an MSLS degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a BA in English literature from Guilford College.

Martín Gómez, City Librarian, Los Angeles Public Library: Martín Gómez is the former City Librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library, which serves over four million people—the largest population of any library in the United States. Throughout his career, Gómez has championed expanded access to library resources in urban communities. Previously, he served as President and CEO of the Urban Libraries Council, which supports research, continuing education and programs that strengthen the public library as an essential part of urban life. As director of the Oakland Public Library, he led the effort to establish the African American Museum and Library at Oakland as a major division of the library. He also spearheaded a digital revolution at the Brooklyn Public Library, the country’s fourth largest library system. He is a graduate of the University of California, Los Angeles and received his MA in library science from the University of Arizona, where he received the 2001 Distinguished Alumnus Award. In April 2012, he was appointed Vice Dean of Libraries at the University of Southern California.

Emily Gore, Florida State University: Emily Gore is Associate Dean for Digital Scholarship and Technology Services at Florida State University. Prior to joining FSU, Emily held positions at Clemson University, NC ECHO (State Library of North Carolina) and East Carolina University. During the course of her career, Emily has received over $2.5 million in grant funding for technology/digital initiatives. Emily is a member of the Frye Leadership Institute Class of 2011, the 2009 LYRASIS NextGen Librarian Award winner for Technology, and is a convener of the Technical Workstream for the Digital Public Library of America.

Luis Herrera, San Francisco Public Library: Luis Herrera is the City Librarian for the City and County of San Francisco. Prior to assuming his current position, he served for ten years as the Director of the Department of Information Services of the Pasadena Public Library. Previously, he was the Deputy Director of the San Diego Public Library and has also served in public library management in Long Beach, California, and El Paso, Texas. Mr. Herrera is also a former middle school librarian. He holds a bachelor’s degree from the University of Texas at El Paso and
an MLS from the University of Arizona. He also earned an MPA from California State University, Long Beach, where he received the Future Urban Administrator Award. He served as the 2003–2004 President of the Public Library Association, and has also served as President of the California Library Association and REFORMA, the National Association of Library Services to the Spanish Speaking. He was also a member of the Council of the American Library Association from 1996–2000. Mr. Herrera has been active in partnering with community-based organizations to design library service delivery programs that enhance information literacy among youth. His passion is to work with local schools and community colleges to build a community of readers. Currently, he serves on the boards of the California Council for the Humanities and the Latino Community Foundation. He is also the author of numerous articles on library strategic planning and the role the library plays in forging community partnerships. In 2002, he was a keynote speaker in London, England, at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Conference on the People’s Network, a technology initiative providing public access computing in libraries throughout the United Kingdom. His vision is to promote libraries as innovative and dynamic organizations working in partnership with communities to enhance the quality of life. Mr. Herrera participated in the session, “Libraries and Museums in an Era of Participatory Culture,” convened jointly by the Salzburg Global Seminar (SGS) and the Institute of Museum and Library Services, held in October 2011 at the Schloss Leopoldskron in Salzburg, Austria.

**Susan Hildreth, Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services:** On January 19, 2011, President Obama appointed Susan Hildreth to be director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The nomination to her new post was confirmed by the US Senate by unanimous consent on December 22, 2010. Hildreth is the former City Librarian of Seattle where she managed the Seattle Public Library, which includes the world-renowned Central Library and 26 new and expanded branches. The Library operated on a $50 million budget, had approximately 650 staff members, served more than 14 million visitors, and circulated nearly 12 million books and materials in 2010. Hildreth was the former State Librarian of California, where she managed a $70 million administrative budget supporting library and research services for the state government and funding and consultation for California libraries. Before her 2004 appointment by California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, she was City Librarian of San Francisco, overseeing an annual operating budget of more than $58 million and a $130 million building program. She was president of the Public Library Association and served on its board of directors, and was an elected member of the council that governs the American Library Association. She was a longtime member of the California Library Association and served as its president and treasurer. Hildreth graduated cum laude from Syracuse University and holds a master’s degree in library science from the State University of New York at Albany and a master’s degree in business from Rutgers University.

**Carol Linn, Linn & Logan, Project Survey Results:** With over 25 years of experience in public libraries, Carol Linn has an in-depth and extensive knowledge of the vital public services they provide as well as strong project management abilities. As Special Projects Coordinator at Brooklyn Public Library (BPL) she planned and implemented enterprise-wide projects in a complex urban environment serving diverse communities, including strategic plans, facilities planning and transforming public services to incorporate emerging technologies. Her current consulting projects include managing the BTOP project at BPL, providing consulting services for the architectural firm TEN Arquitectos, and working with Martín Gómez on this conference, “Creating a Blueprint for a National Digital Public Library.” Carol received a BA in art history from Bryn Mawr College and an MA in library science from the University of Chicago.

**Giovanna Mannino, Los Angeles Public Library:** Giovanna Mannino is the Interim Director of the Richard J. Riordan Central Library. She has been with the Los Angeles Public Library since 1974, having served as a Children’s Librarian, Branch Manager, Adult Services Coordinator and Assistant Director of Information Technologies & Collections, where she managed the library’s automated system, electronic resources, technical and collection services. She has a BA in English from UCLA, and received her MLS from California State University, Fullerton.

**Maura Marx: Harvard University:** Maura Marx is Director of the Digital Public Library of America Secretariat at the Berkman Center at Harvard University. As Executive Director of the Open Knowledge Commons, she worked to catalyze and fund collaborative digital library initiatives. Previously, she founded the digital library program at the
Boston Public Library and was responsible for its dedication to open principles. Her interests are in cultural heritage, collaboration and the promotion of all types of open knowledge. Before coming to libraries she studied literature and worked in the rare book trade, museums and the film business in Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Germany and the UK. Maura holds a BA from the University of Notre Dame, an MA from Middlebury College and an MSLIS from Simmons College.

**Waller McGuire, St. Louis Public Library:** Ranked among the top five urban libraries in America for the past six years in the country’s leading study of libraries and literacy, the St. Louis Public library was this year ranked as the number two system in the nation. In the past due to its well-utilized public library, St. Louis has been consistently recognized as one of the most literate cities in the United States. Waller McGuire has been Executive Director of the St. Louis Public Library since 2004 and is responsible for a 16-branch system with 300 employees and an annual operating budget of $21 million. He joined the library in 1989 and held positions as Assistant Branch Manager and Branch Manager before serving for ten years as the System’s Deputy Director. In that role, McGuire had the primary responsibility of developing and implementing a master plan to renovate and rebuild the branch system. Over a period of ten years, ten of the system’s 16 branches have been renovated or built anew for a total cost of $30 million. McGuire’s first task upon becoming Director was to complete a master plan for the restoration and modernization for Central Library, the library’s main headquarters. Opened in 1912, Central Library is located in the heart of downtown St. Louis and was designed by Cass Gilbert, one of America’s most celebrated architects. Some of Gilbert’s other notable designs are New York’s Woolworth Building, completed in 1913 and the US Supreme Court Building, completed in 1935. McGuire currently oversees the implementation of the $70 million Central Library renovation project, scheduled for completion in late 2012. A native of Lexington, Kentucky, McGuire resides in St. Louis’ Central West End. He holds a BA from Earlham College and earned his master’s in library science from the University of Kentucky.

**Mary Minow, LibraryLaw.com:** Mary Minow is a library law consultant based in California. She consults on copyright, privacy, intellectual freedom and other information access issues. She is the Follett Chair, Dominican University Graduate School of Library and Information Science. She manages the Stanford Copyright and Fair Use website and its FairlyUsed blog. Mary has a master’s in library science from the University of Michigan and a law degree from Stanford University.

**Chip Nilges, OCLC:** Chip Nilges is Vice President, Business Development, and is responsible for OCLC’s content strategy, which includes the OCLC FirstSearch online reference service. Chip was formerly Vice President, New Product Planning, and before that was Executive Director, OCLC WorldCat Content and Global Access. He joined OCLC in 1994 and has held several key roles, including leadership of FirstSearch, new products and WorldCat content. Chip holds an MBA, a master’s in English, and a bachelor’s degree in English, all from Ohio State University. With a view on both the business and technical aspects of libraries and library services, Chip speaks on the future of the industry and technology trends, Library 2.0 and OCLC’s flagship products, including WorldCat and e-content offerings.

**John Palfrey, Harvard University:** John Palfrey is Henry N. Ess Professor of Law and Vice Dean for Library and Information Resources at Harvard Law School. He is the author of *Intellectual Property Strategy* (MIT Press, 2011) and co-author of *Born Digital: Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives* (Basic Books, 2008), among other books. He is a faculty co-director of the Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University and was formerly its executive director. His research is focused on Internet law, intellectual property and international law. He is the chair of the Steering Committee of the Digital Public Library of America. Outside of Harvard Law School, he serves on the Board of Trustees of the Knight Foundation and is a Venture Executive at Highland Capital Partners. John is a graduate of Harvard College, the University of Cambridge and Harvard Law School. He writes a blog at http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/palfrey/ and is jpalfrey on Twitter.

**Catherine Quinlan, University of Southern California:** Catherine Quinlan was appointed dean of the USC Libraries on August 1, 2007. She is responsible for guiding the university’s efforts to establish the model for the 21st century library at USC; building world-class scholarly research collections; and creating partnerships with arts, culture
and library institutions throughout Southern California and around the world. Quinlan came to USC after a decade at the University of British Columbia, where she headed a library system encompassing more than 300 full-time staff members distributed over more than 20 sites. Beginning in 2004, she also served as managing director of the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre, a $74 million facility located on the UBC campus that is a prototype for academic information management and dissemination. Prior to joining UBC, she spent seven years as director of libraries and chief librarian at the University of Western Ontario, and as an adjunct professor in the university’s Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Previously, Quinlan oversaw the health sciences library at Memorial University of Newfoundland and was a member of the adjunct business administration faculty. Quinlan has published extensively on the importance of information literacy and has lectured at educational institutions around the world. She has written recently on topics in library administration, change management and strategic planning, and the information-seeking behavior of students in physical and virtual library spaces. She is a Fellow of the Annenberg School, a member of the Urban Land Institute Think Tank, and has served on the board of directors of numerous professional organizations, including the Canadian Association of Research Libraries and the Pacific Rim Digital Library Alliance. Quinlan holds an MBA from Memorial University of Newfoundland, a master of library studies degree from Dalhousie University and a bachelor of music degree from Queen’s University.

**Peggy Rudd, Texas State Library and Archives Commission:** Peggy D. Rudd has served as the Director and Librarian of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission since October 1999. Her previous library service includes the Steen Library at Stephen F. Austin State University, the Undergraduate Library at the University of Texas at Austin, Austin Public Library, Central Texas Library System, Northeast Texas Library System, the Library of Virginia and the State Library of Florida. Ms. Rudd has a BA in English and political science from Stephen F. Austin State University and received her MLS from the University of Texas at Austin.

**Amy Rudersdorf, State Library of North Carolina:** Amy Rudersdorf is the Director of the Digital Information Management Program at the State Library of North Carolina. This small but tenacious group identifies and promotes solutions to ensure long-term preservation and ready and permanent public access to born-digital and digitized information produced by (or on behalf of) North Carolina state government. Prior to her work at the State Library, Rudersdorf developed digital collections at North Carolina State University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison. In her “spare time,” she teaches courses on digital preservation (San Jose State University) and metadata (North Carolina Central University).

**Jamie Seemiller, Denver Public Library:** Jamie Seemiller is the Program Administrator for the IMLS grant “Creating Your Community” at the Denver Public Library Western History/Genealogy Department. After receiving her MLIS from the University of Denver, Jamie joined the Western History staff as an Archivist. In 2008, Jamie managed the Creating Communities project, which digitized archival material from historic Denver neighborhoods. In 2010, the project expanded into a participatory archive that encourages communities to share and interact with their history.

**Ben Vershbow, New York Public Library:** Ben Vershbow is Manager of NYPL Labs, an experimental technology unit at The New York Public Library that generates ideas and tools for digital research. Labs’ work ranges across many areas including: developing imaginative new interfaces for archival collections; transforming library materials into open digital data sets; engaging new publics through crowdsourcing and open source tool-building; and empowering the library’s next generation of digital curators. Before joining NYPL in 2008, Ben was Editorial Director at The Institute for the Future of the Book, a Brooklyn-based think tank exploring the evolution of reading, writing and publishing in the digital age. @nypl_labs / labs@nypl.org

**Jeremy York, HathiTrust:** Jeremy York has been the Project Librarian for HathiTrust since July 2008. His primary duties include project coordination among the partnership, maintenance of HathiTrust’s informational website, and activities surrounding new partners and partnership contracts. Jeremy received a bachelor’s degree in history from Emory University and a master’s of information science from the University of Michigan, with a specialization in archives and records management.
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Martín Gómez  Los Angeles Public Library
Dena Gould  Los Angeles Public Library
Gloria Grover  Los Angeles Public Library
Madeline Kerr  Los Angeles Public Library
Won-Tack Kim  Los Angeles Public Library
Lupie Leyva  Los Angeles Public Library
David Lopez  Los Angeles Public Library
Kren Malone  Los Angeles Public Library
Giovanna Mannino  Los Angeles Public Library
Jeanne McKay  Los Angeles Public Library
Kyle Millager  Los Angeles Public Library
Stella Mittelbach  Los Angeles Public Library
Paul Montgomerie  Los Angeles Public Library
Robin Moon  Los Angeles Public Library
Kris Morita  Los Angeles Public Library
Sheila Nash  Los Angeles Public Library
Jeong Oh  Los Angeles Public Library
Madeline Pena  Los Angeles Public Library
Peter Persic  Los Angeles Public Library
Jonathan Pitre  Los Angeles Public Library
Michele Raeburn  Los Angeles Public Library
Christina Rice  Los Angeles Public Library
Emma Roberts  Los Angeles Public Library
Eloisa Sarao  Los Angeles Public Library
Ruth Seid  Los Angeles Public Library
Jim Sherod  Los Angeles Public Library
Loren Spector  Los Angeles Public Library
Dora Suarez  Los Angeles Public Library
David Tulanian  Los Angeles Public Library
Andy Vuong  Los Angeles Public Library
Dawn Willey  Los Angeles Public Library
Rita Walters  Los Angeles Public Library
Robin Dale  Los Angeles Public Library
Paula Kiely  Los Angeles Public Library
Heather Cousin  Los Angeles Public Library
Ben Vershbow  Los Angeles Public Library
Cathy De Rosa  Los Angeles Public Library
Ricky Erway  Los Angeles Public Library
Chrystie Hill  Los Angeles Public Library
Chip Nilges  Los Angeles Public Library
Maura Marx  Los Angeles Public Library
Andrea Dietze  Los Angeles Public Library
Helen Fried  Los Angeles Public Library
Katherine Gould  Los Angeles Public Library
Debby Stegura  Los Angeles Public Library
Jan Sanders  Los Angeles Public Library
Linda Crowe  Los Angeles Public Library
Barb Macikas  Los Angeles Public Library
Jeanette Contreras  Los Angeles Public Library
Jason Buydos  Los Angeles Public Library
Kim Fender  Los Angeles Public Library
Kate Mulligan  Los Angeles Public Library
Ramiro Salazar  Los Angeles Public Library
Susan Moore  Los Angeles Public Library
Brian Bannon  Los Angeles Public Library
Luis Herrera  Los Angeles Public Library
Nate Hill  Los Angeles Public Library
Karla Bluestone  Los Angeles Public Library
Diggy Gomez  Los Angeles Public Library

LYRASIS
Milwaukee Public Library
Moorpark City Library
New York Public Library
OCLC
OKC/DPLA
Orange County Public Libraries
Orange County Public Libraries
Palos Verdes Library District
Palos Verdes Library District
Pasadena Public Library
Peninsula Library Network
PLA
Placentia Library District
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County
Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors
San Antonio Public Library
San Diego County Library
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Public Library
San Jose Public Library
San Jose State University
San Jose State University
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Shearer</td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Snider</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Garza</td>
<td>SCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Freiermuth</td>
<td>St. Louis Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller McGuire</td>
<td>St. Louis Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Rudersdorf</td>
<td>State Library of North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Rudd</td>
<td>Texas State Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Cummings</td>
<td>Tulsa City-County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Shaffer</td>
<td>Tulsa City-County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Strong</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Passey</td>
<td>Uintah Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Geiger</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colette Chaffee</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Benton</td>
<td>Urban Libraries Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avril Cunningham</td>
<td>USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Quinlan</td>
<td>USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Bryan</td>
<td>Whitman County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Morasch</td>
<td>Whitman County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Bellinger</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metadata Standards


Last updated: 04/17/2008

The following table, taken from Anne Gilliland’s essay in Introduction to Metadata (revised edition, 2008, cited below), provides a typology of data standards and how they should work together, with examples. There is usually a direct relationship between the cost of metadata creation and the benefit to the user: Describing each item is more expensive than describing collections or groups of items; using a rich, complex metadata scheme is more expensive than using a simple metadata scheme; applying standard subject vocabularies and classification schemes is more expensive than assigning a few uncontrolled keywords; and so on. It should be noted however, that expenditures in development often result in greater efficiency and effectiveness for the end user. Use of a standardized subject thesaurus or other controlled vocabulary, for example, can provide greater precision and recall in searching, and can enable future functionality, such as faceted subject browsing and dynamic searching of subject matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data Standard</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data structure standards (metadata element sets, schemas). These are “categories”</td>
<td>The set of MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging format) fields, EAD,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or “containers” of data that make up a record or other information object.</td>
<td>Dublin Core Metadata Element Set (DCMES), Categories for the Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Works of Art (CDWA), VRA Core Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data value standards (controlled vocabularies, thesauri, controlled lists). These</td>
<td>Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), Library of Congress Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are the terms, names and other values that are used to populate data structure</td>
<td>Authority File (LCNAD), LC Thesaurus for Graphic Materials (TGM), Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards or metadata element sets.</td>
<td>Subject Headings (MeSH), Art &amp; Architecture Thesaurus (AAT), Union List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Artist Names (ULAN), Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (TGN),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICONCLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data content standards (cataloging rules and codes). These are guidelines for the</td>
<td>Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR), Resource Description and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>format and syntax of the data values that are used to populate metadata elements.</td>
<td>(RDA), International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD), Cataloging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Objects (CCO), Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format/technical interchange standards (metadata standards expressed in machine-</td>
<td>MARC21, MARCXML, EAD XML DTD, METS, MODS, CDWA Lite XML schema, Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readable form). This type of standard is often a manifestation of a particular data</td>
<td>Dublin Core XML schema, Qualified Dublin Core XML schema, VRA Core 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure standard (type 1 above), encoded or marked up for machine processing.</td>
<td>XML schema</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decisions about which metadata standard(s) to adopt and what levels of description to apply must be made within the context of the organization’s purpose for creating the collection, the available human and technical resources, the users and intended usage, and approaches adopted within the particular field of inquiry or knowledge domain.

Questions to consider include, but are not limited to:

- What is the purpose of the digital collection?
- What are the goals and objectives for building this collection?
- Who are the targeted users? What information do they need, and what is their typical information-seeking behavior?
Survey Results

Q1. What is the status of your library’s digitization strategy?

- Nonexistent: 46%
- In draft form: 9%
- Under discussion: 32%
- Approved: 13%

n = 229 out of 230

Q2. What types of unique collections have you digitized?

- Photographs: 42%
- Personal correspondence: 10%
- Newspapers: 20%
- Official records: 30%
- Audio: 50%
- Video: 20%
- Microfilm: 30%
- Maps: 40%
- Books: 60%
- Books or monographs for which your library owns the copyright: 50%
- Books or monographs in the public domain: 40%
- None: 10%

n = 206 out of 230
Q3. What is the total number of items you have digitized?

- Fewer than 1,000: 65%
- 1,001 to 5,000: 16%
- 5,001 to 10,000: 7%
- 10,001 to 50,000: 7%
- 50,001 to 100,000: 3%
- More than 100,000: 2%

n = 189 out of 230

Q4. How did/do you fund your project(s)?

- Your institution: 80%
- Federal grant: 9%
- State grant: 9%
- Foundation: 4%
- Consortium: 1%
- Private individual donor(s): 2%

n = 136 out of 230
Q5. What criteria do you use when selecting which collections to digitize?

![Bar chart showing criteria for selecting collections to digitize](chart.png)

Q6. How many people are dedicated to digitization at your library?

(average of all responses is shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE:</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library contract personnel</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contractors who work in the library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourced</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(personnel who digitize off-site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 156 out of 230

n= 148 out of 230
Q7. How do you store your data? Please check all that apply.

- Store in-house: 90%
- Store off-site: 56%
- Shared data storage: 50%

n= 141 out of 230

Q8. What metadata standards, if any, do you use?

- MARC: 53%
- Dublin Core: 53%
- NISO MIX: 34%
- EAD: 16%
- MODS: 14%
- METS: 9%
- PREMIS: 9%
- VRA CORE: 8%
- Self-developed: 5%

n= 106 out of 230
Q9. Do you allow your collection metadata to be harvested for reuse, such as by contributing your metadata to OCLC?

Yes: 37%
No: 63%

n = 133 out of 230

Q10. What platform(s) are you using to provide public access to your digitized collections? Please check all that apply.

- CONTENTdm
- InMagic
- ILS
- Other vendor solution
- Home-built solution
- Social sites (blogs, photo sharing sites, wikis, etc.)

n = 111 out of 230
Q11. How do you make your digitized collections accessible? Please check all that apply.

- Your library’s website
- Your consortium’s website
- Statewide website
- National organization’s website (e.g., IMLS aggregation portal)
- In-library use only

n = 135 out of 230

Q12. Is your digital material ADA-compliant?

- Yes, entirely
- Yes, partly
- I don’t know
- No

n = 138 out of 230
Q13. In general, how do you license your digitized materials? Please check all that apply.

- Research/personal use only: 20%
- Commercial reproduction (rights licensing): 10%
- None if in public domain: 5%
- Creative Commons licenses: 20%
- Fee for use: 10%
- Fair use only: 30%

(n=120 out of 230)

Q14. Do you have a strategy for maintaining public access to your digitized collections as technologies evolve?

- Under discussion: 35%
- Non-existent: 56%
- Approved: 4%
- In draft form: 5%

(n=177 out of 230)
Q15. What percentage of your unique collections is in need of digitization?

- 0 to 20%: 32%
- 21 to 40%: 10%
- 41 to 60%: 36%
- 61 to 80%: 16%
- 81 to 100%: 6%

n = 188 out of 230

Q16. What parts of your unique collections have you not been able to digitize?
Please check all that apply.

- Maps/cartographic materials: 40%
- Photographs: 47%
- Letters, diaries, scrapbooks or personal correspondence: 39%
- Newspapers: 55%
- Official records: 43%
- Audio recordings: 38%
- Video recordings: 41%
- Microfilm/fiche: 46%
- Books/monographs for which your library owns the copyright: 41%
- Books/monographs in the public domain: 42%
- None: 13%

n = 161 out of 230
Q17. What are the barriers that prevent you from digitizing your unique collections?

- Inadequate technology or equipment
- Insufficient staff time
- Insufficient staff training/expertise
- Lack of experience with applying for and administering grants
- Rights management issues

n = 201 out of 230