

Draft Redacted Minutes: ADHO Steering Committee Meeting, 2014 (Lausanne)

Draft Minutes: ADHO Steering Committee Meeting, 2014 (Lausanne)

Attendance:

Voting, Day 1:

- Paul Arthur (PA)
- Susan Brown (SB)
- Bethany Nowviskie (delegated to Julia Flanders)
- Chris Meister (JCM)
- Masahiro Shimoda (MS)
- Stéfan Sinclair (SS)
- Paul Spence (PS)
- Melissa Terras (MT)
- Kay Walter (KW)

Voting, Day 2:

- Paul Arthur (PA)
- Susan Brown (SB)
- Bethany Nowviskie (BN; delegated to Kathleen Fitzpatrick, KF)
- Chris Meister (JCM)
- Masahiro Shimoda (MS)
- Stéfan Sinclair (SS)
- Kay Walter (KW)
- Arianna Ciula (AC)
- Karina van Dalen (KD)

Non-voting:

- David Beaven (DB)
- Elisabeth Burr (EB)
- Øyvind Eide (OE)
- Kathleen Fitzpatrick (KF)
- Julia Flanders (JF)
- Neil Fraistat (NF)
- Jarom McDonald (JM)
- Charles Muller (CM)
- John Nerbonne (JN)
- Harold Short (HS)
- Lisa Spiro (LS)
- Glen Worthey (GW)
- Ray Siemens (RS)

Summary of Action Items

- JM will follow up with John Unsworth on TEI-C payment for server maintenance (and will note it in ADHO budget)
- Action on JM: do some research on conservative investment options including mutual funds.
- Action on KW and NF: investigate possibility of using centerNet's incorporation in the U.S. to facilitate ADHO reimbursements to U.S. payees.
- Action on JM: contact different COs to get information about incorporation, region of legal activity, treasurer and related officers
- Action on Secretariat: confirm deadlines for all action items
- Action item for SC to give thought about how best to recognize 30th anniversary of LLC at next year's conference
- Action item on JCM: make contact with VS to ascertain who would be the best contact at OUP for this.
- Action item on Infrastructure committee: develop a plan to create a robust system based on DHWriter.
- Action on Secretariat to establish 2015 meeting schedule ASAP - (e.g. to enable travel planning)
- CCC needs to propose the addition of metadata field in ConfTool to represent the language of submissions.
- Action: Chair of PC needs to liaise with Chair of Awards committee in late summer about Fortier Prize consideration and any other issues of shared concern.
- Action on CCC: seek legal counsel from DARIAH-DE lawyer
- Action on CCC by August 31: we want to hear a proposal back within 6 weeks to change ConfTool
- Action on CCC: by August 31 make proposal for compiling public material including costs for aggregating the abstracts; seek prior aggregation from John Unsworth and then designate someone (Scott Weingart?) to find any remaining conference abstracts that have escaped the net.

Sunday, July 6 --- EPFL Campus, room BC 410

9:00 Call to Order (Neil, 30 min.)

- Minutes and note-taking (shared Google Doc, Glen and Julia)
- Attendance / Introductions (Neil)
 - note of absences (condolences to Bethany)
 - notes of individual attendees
- Confirm voting members (Neil)
- Overview of agenda:
 - special note of decisions and votes that need to be taken during the meeting
 - note on strategic process: not NF's intention to vote on all matters; no urgency, but rather wants to make sure we get the process right; note parking lot page on wiki for issues that will require more discussion
 - note spectacular number (5) of conference hosting bids this year - highest ever?
- Matters arising (urgent matters that require a spot on the agenda) -- none identified

9:30 Treasurer's report and budget discussion (Jarom, 1 hr)

Gratitude expressed to Paul Spence, ADHO Treasurer for 6 years, establishing strong fiscal and reporting infrastructure

Three areas to touch on:

- 2013 revenue disbursement
- 2014 planned expenditures (both ongoing and new)
- Impact of these reports on ADHO planning and activities
- NB postponing strategic issues for the later discussion of strategy

Membership levels and income calculated on calendar year income (minus operating costs), assessed at end of December 2013, of which ADHO gets 70%. This money is sent from OUP to EADH (which owns the journal).

Following this meeting, once we settle 2014 budget, disbursements are made to COs. Now that ADHO is incorporated, an issue arises of how best to handle financial structure; we may decide to make some modifications: e.g. have EADH pass bulk sum to ADHO, or have EADH do disbursement directly to COs.

Note that 2013 levels are almost identical with 2012; but NB that 2012 had seen exceptional growth already.

HS: another factor leading to apparently flat growth levels: 2013 was first year of membership-only option for students. JM: since 2014 that membership-only option was extended to all, we'll want to watch the effect of that change on the income levels. PS: note that membership numbers are up, but due to lower per-member income, overall income level remains flat. We will probably in future see growth in income from membership-only subscriptions.

HS: Has been keeping records on membership-only subscriptions; his model suggests that we've weathered the period when there was a risk that membership-only subscriptions would diminish overall income; these now are purely additive on top of LLC subscription income.

JM notes that conference continues to be a driving force in membership numbers.

NF: would it be useful to see the changing breakdown in amount of income coming from subscriptions and membership-only, respectively?

2013 income is used to pay 2014 expenses; as of end of 2013, ADHO had significantly underspent its income, not even considering the historical reserves. JM notes that many backstop budgets were not spent. NB thanks Nebraska once again for its conference contribution. Major expenditure categories are the same as in previous years, these are not expected to change:

- subvention expenditures
- CO disbursements

This year, anticipated revenue distribution after deduction of ADHO expenditures is 42%; a bit lower compared with last year's revenue distribution level of 46%. Still healthier than in years past (in the 35% range). [NB that 42% is projected; may still change based on financial decisions

made during this meeting]

NB: CenterNet income was very close to \$3K minimum CO disbursement last year; this year it will substantially surpass that minimum. JADH showed greater membership growth than any other CO.

Question about use of LLC subvention: it goes for some editorial expenses, modest conference costs for editor. ADHO support for LLC:

- subvention (4000 GBP for editorial costs; Øyvind notes that this is essentially the “extra income” money from OUP for editorial expenses, so it is offset rather than really coming from ADHO budget)
- backstop (500 GBP)
- travel allotment for face-to-face editorial meetings (2000 GBP)

CM notes that previously EADH paid toward additional LLC expenses (e.g., travel for editor); a decision was taken recently by SC vote (a few years ago?) that these expenses would be covered by ADHO, rather than EADH.

Edward Vanhoutte will be making a proposal for updated LLC budget.

Infrastructure committee continues to cover expenses for web hosting for ADHO and other affiliate (TEI, DHQ, et al.).

- ADHO continues to pay monthly contract for systems administration
- NB fallback contract for when Ian Rifkin is on holiday; hasn't been needed yet, position hasn't been filled; JCM suggests that we may just not need this after all, just bear the risk.

NB asks JCM whether any significant Infrastructure expenses foreseen; there are none.

Note funding for Communications fellows, one of whom is at the conference, where she'll be doing video interviews of attendees.

NB an additional income item from TEI, payment for server hosting via ADHO; JM will follow up with John Unsworth.

Note once again Nebraska hosts' sizable contribution back to ADHO as a one-time grant to support future conferences. Use of “seed grant” from University of Nebraska:

- funding for face-to-face strategic planning meeting
- additional 7 bursaries for DH2014 (for a total of 18 bursaries to a total of 21 attendees)

NF: now that we are independently incorporated, we can fundraise; bursaries would be a high priority. Need to think about the right mechanism for organizing our fundraising activity

OE: bursaries are historically a strong motivator for funding contributions

MT asks whether there ought to be a single point of contact / spearhead on SC to coordinate fundraising efforts? KW notes that we'll be talking about this question of funding during strategic discussion later. JN notes that this effort will require communication, energy, coordination, etc. JF notes that this may be an opportunity to bring in a new officer to the SC

(similar to the way we brought in LS as communications officer)

OE: should perhaps also be a group, maybe a subcommittee to reflect geographic diversity; person should have international support group given country-specific differences in fundraising.

NF: think about bringing in people from constituencies we'd like to reach, e.g., industry

SS: this sits between the COs and ADHO; in some discussions, the effort might be more effective if expressed by the CO (esp. for regionally specific potential donors)

JM: EADH, AADH, and centerNet are formally incorporated; other COs are not. If all COs were legal entities and could receive funds, they might be the face of fundraising, with ADHO remaining as the bank.

JCM: different legal requirements concerning non-profit organizational fundraising; need to respect this diversity by involving COs.

JF wonders whether we still need a single point-person on the SC, even if the work is distributed geographically and across COs. Needs to be communication and coordination among different efforts.

NF notes RS's long experience in fundraising for DHSI bursaries, asks for advice; RS assents.

NF and JF suggest a sort of "fundraising committee" with a point person on the SC. KW notes conference as fundraising opportunity (and reminds us of the strategy report on fundraising by OE, RS, KW, Dan O'Donnell) - link?

Draft motion: identify a fundraising chair, with the task of forming a task force? NF suggests the strategy funding group, with additional geographic representation. SS suggests coordination with 4Humanities

JCM suggests a professional fundraiser; JN notes importance of acknowledging what donors generally want/need in exchange

Motion: Form a fundraising task force with geographic representation that is sufficiently broad, including coordination with 4Humanities. Carried unanimously

JM: back to budget discussion, noting reserve fund.

SS: do we have income-producing account? Generally thought that we don't. Consider investing the reserve fund in some interest-bearing asset. JM notes that this has been suggested but not decided (although is strongly in favor). Issue of how conservative we should be with the investment strategy. Liquidity is a factor; we do have a separate contingency fund so we would need it to be available within a few months but not a few days. Could use a certificate of deposit approach; NB very low interest. KW: could investigate an investment company (e.g. mutual fund). **Action on JM: do some research on conservative investment options including mutual funds.**

JM: because we're banking in the Netherlands, in Euros, proposes that most of reporting from

this point forward should be done in Euros (including publicity for awards) rather than GBP, to simplify the accounting. OUP will continue to pay in GBP and COs can continue to do their own banking in their own currencies. No objections.

JM notes that it's been simple to provide reimbursements from new ADHO account to European and Japanese people; US recipients have proven more difficult (Rabobank has not been able to issue checks to US payees.) For now, JM has set up a DBA account to facilitate payments to North American reimbursees; this is a short-term solution. JM will have a proposal for a longer-term solution; perhaps might involve having multiple countries of incorporation for ADHO. JN: perhaps centerNet could help with this since they are incorporated in USA. AADH (also legally incorporated) could serve the same function in the Australasian region and could partner on grant applications if needed. **Action on KW and NF: investigate this possibility on behalf of centerNet.**

JCM: similar situation for the EADH associate organizations now being formed for German-speaking DH organizations; has flexible ability to broker financial transactions and relationships as needed, and can serve as point of access for bilateral grant applications that need this geographical involvement.

NF suggests need for some kind of list of those incorporated COs, and their treasurers, to coordinate. This should be a two-way flow between ADHO and COs.

Action on JM: contact different COs to get information about incorporation, region of legal activity, treasurer and related officers

NF thanks both JM and PS for their excellent work for the taxing job of treasurer activity -- not an invisible activity by any means!

10:30 Break

10:40 LLC Publisher Report and related OUP issues (Harold, Victoria Smith; 50 mins)

Additional anticipated questions, post-report:

- Possibility of ADHO developing its own membership management system, and relaying subscription information and associated revenue to OUP
- Benefits and risks of such a move
- Required processes for a transition to this arrangement

VS walked us through significant developments in publishing industry and OUP (all are given in more detail in LLC report:

- movement towards open access has been influential; NB Finch Report
- OUP has done a pilot scheme giving access to journal content to public libraries; opt-in for libraries; for this reason, immediate impact may not be large. Access limited to users within library, no print/download/off-site access
- LLC added to "Deep Dyve," a "rent" scheme: small fee for temporary access
- NB HEFCE policy on open access (without mandating a particular license); OUP is now compliant, for both Green and Gold OA. See LLC report for more detail.
- JCM asks who decides on closed vs open state, identity of repository, and embargo period, for individual articles. VS responds that it is the decision of the author. NB: this

is the “final accepted” version that goes into the institutional repository, before copy-editing and typesetting.

- pre-print version may be posted prior to acceptance
- post-print (“final accepted”) version may be added to institutional repository and can be made visible after the LLC-stipulated embargo period is over
- VS notes that there are guidelines for these topics on the LLC website
- Text mining explicitly allowed for non-commercial purposes (pursuant to new UK legislation); no burden on OUP to facilitate this, but libraries are now free to pursue this for researchers
- NB journal collection (i.e., package) sales are growing, individual (i.e. specifically LLC) subscriptions are declining (same trend as in previous years, expected to continue in future years); access in developing countries continues to grow very slowly
- Membership-only option has indeed led to decrease of individual subscriptions
- 2013 Impact factor has not yet been released; expected by end of this month. OUP will be keeping an eye on that; NB good result last year
- Online usage for LLC is strong; downloads of abstracts show steady and substantial increase through 2013 (anticipated lower in 2014) while TOC pages and full-text seem flat. Note that apparently lower 2014-to-date abstract views are calculated differently: simple “hover-over” of abstracts are not counted (and NB that presence of the hover means that fewer people need to actually click on the abstract to read it; hence lower abstract view numbers).
- Note much good usage of articles from recent years; also that conference issues generate an disproportionately large number of top-downloaded articles
- Author feedback on both peer-review and pre-publication processes: a relatively small number of authors choose to give feedback, but generally very positive
- Production changes: electronic proofing tools, author mss tracking -- basic result being that authors remain more in the picture, thus less need for OUP intervention in the process.
- In 2013-2014, overall publication targets have been met; issues are produced on schedule; articles published online in advance of print are especially timely except in cases of author delay.
- SS: question about the journal’s renaming (and related refocus of journal content) and the selection of impact factor category (linguistics):
 - VS solicits suggestions for conferences at which OUP should do outreach
 - NF: should alert COs to this opportunity: identify conferences where the journal under new name would have special appeal
 - VF notes that the impact factor category is not subject to the journal’s control
 - NB as well that the journal’s 30th anniversary is coming up soon.
 - JCM: EADH and OUP are also starting discussion of a design change
 - MT: Edward had suggested publishing a “greatest hits” issue with current scholarly recontextualization; VF suggests doing this as a virtual issue, pulling it together online with a landing page, make it all free to view for a short period.
 - **NF: Action item for SC to give thought about how best to recognize 30th anniversary of LLC at next year’s conference**
- SS: this year, he was able to pay via the OUP form, congratulations and kudos; question about skinning; NF notes that this is now enfolded in some larger issues.

- JCM: question about circulation breakdown: 2011 and 2012 totals look incorrect. VS suspects that numbers were pulled incorrectly from the OUP system; will regenerate the table and resend the report.
- JCM also thanks VS / OUP for professional and very comforting advice on the title change. VS notes that a working group has been set up to enable this transition as it happens.
- NF also notes quick and effective interventions and troubleshooting by OUP when individuals have trouble subscribing
- SS: re impact factor: OUP would have more influence than ADHO with Thompson-Reuters on issues of how impact factor is assessed (i.e. to take greater account of the ways impact is registered in blogs and other forms of new scholarship). VS notes that OUP doesn't have any particular influence with T-R on this.

NF: issues from the above: ADHO proposes developing its own membership module; what is OUP's reaction to this? VS notes both that the OUP site is required to work for all their journals, and that recent changes have improved the experience.

However, VS notes no problem on part of OUP with having membership management handled by ADHO, as long as appropriate information about subscribers is fed back to OUP in a timely way.

HS: we would send subscriber information at regular intervals (frequency TBD) and then OUP would invoice at the end of the year for subscription income.

NF: any risks we should be aware of? VS: just make sure systems are set up effectively...

HS: when last discussing this, the people who designed new OUP system didn't think it would be possible to automate the feed of information; VS confirms that this is true; ADHO would need to send information manually.

NF notes that we would need a process for the transition; what would be the needs on OUP's end? VS would need to speak with colleagues. Would probably involve questions of how to pass current subscriber information, how to handle renewals process, etc., and agreeing on how data would be passed back and forth.

JCM: is there a particular OUP contact (technical person) who knows how to interface with OUP system? ADHO will need a web designer to program pieces that can tap into OUP page for information as needed. VS will identify who is appropriate. **Action item on JCM: make contact with VS to ascertain who would be the best contact at OUP for this.**

Timing on the transition: JCM: can it be timed to coincide with name change? Consensus: unlikely. Name change is as of Jan. 2015, but we would likely only be ready by 2016 at the earliest.

11:30 Report on DH2014 and DH2015 (Melissa, Paul A., 45 mins)

- Discussion issues raised in Melissa's 2014 PC report:
 - Support for PC chair
 - Need for more reviewers

- Non-English language reviewers
- ConfTool improvements
 - Language of submission
 - Paper-Reviewer matching
 - Check box for Fortier Prize consideration

Progress to date on DH2015 (PA)

- Website already live: <http://dh2015.org>. Note design by “Rabbithole Studio” - a student studio working on real-world projects, including this site. Responsive, stylable. Advance information about travel and tourism possibilities (trusted travel resources, etc.)
- Using external professional conference organizing group, with close coordination
- Social media campaign has started to encourage early planning
- Theme of “global DH” includes both global DH activity, but also first non-North American / European DH conference, and a slightly different mix of papers, etc.
- Keynotes confirmed: Genevieve Bell, Jeffrey Schnapp, Tim Sherratt
- HS notes the desire to make it a really regional (Asian Pacific) event -- e.g., working with GO::DH to attract regional speaker invitations, to give speakers more than one reason to travel. Also looking to broaden funding for student bursaries.
- It’s already possible to book. (MT asks for confirmation of meeting times soon; **Action on Secretariat to establish that schedule.**)

Report on DH2014 (Claire Clivaz and Frédéric Kaplan)

- Tight coordination with campus
- Phased arrival of participants eases the impact
- Very large registration numbers (above 700), 8 parallel sessions
- Huge recognition and thanks to Kevin Baumer who has really taken care of all the logistics very successfully
- Huge recognition and thanks to ADHO from CC and FK for the welcome into the community
- Thanks to Melissa Terras for her incredibly hard work
- This event has had a strong effect in helping to launch DH at these institutions
- NF offers special thanks for Local Hosts covering tonight’s All-Exec dinner, in addition to reception after Bethany’s keynote

Melissa Terras’s report on PC2014:

- thanks to local hosts; much larger conference than anticipated (over 700 submissions through confTool)
- thanks as well to members of the community for handling the reviewer burden; 2700 reviews needed (to guarantee 4 reviews each) from just over 300 reviewers. E.g. Michael Sperberg-McQueen did over 30 reviews (including many multi-paper panels) -- a heroic effort.
- Thanks to JN for recruiting reviewers, and also for substantial diplomatic work
- very substantial number of posters accepted -- for a total of over 60% acceptance rate. (Without posters, around 50% acceptance.)
- Notes (apparently) first-ever case of cheating, a most disappointing development.

Peer review problems and efforts

- JN notes with sadness (as stated in CCC report) - the 18% non-fulfillment of Nebraska conference reviews. This year, through herculean efforts, the non-fulfillment level is around 6%. Deb Verhoeven will continue MT's tradition of asking for specific confirmation of reviewer status. JN suggests other measures as well. JN insists that our community has a real problem in this area that really must be acknowledged. JN and MT note that there is an important difference between "declining" and "failing to review".
- PS notes that his Hamburg efforts to get more peer reviewers led him to crucial need to increase geographic and linguistic spread of reviewers
- There will be specific invitations at this conference to recruit more peer reviewers, including at keynotes and through ConfTool-generated email invitations
- JCM: need to emphasize the role of reviewing as identifying potential new material in DH, rather than policing of boundaries; send a message to reviewers that assessing a paper means reaching out and broadening the community rather than just measuring against a yardstick of strict disciplinary criteria; makes the reviewing feel less onerous
- OE: recruiting individuals via the program committee is a good idea; remember that we need people with border expertise in related areas, not just people who are centrally located in DH
- RS: Susan Hockey recommended reviewing the list of reviewers back in 2005/6; did a cull of the list and looked at those who hadn't responded and removed them. Also looked at motives for reviewing; noted that in many cases the review process comes without reward; instituted a way of thanking all the reviewers. Maybe there's a way to provide a greater reward. JN confirms that reviewing is not professionally counted. RS: perhaps call the reviewing process "Program Review Board" or something that sounds official. MT has written 50 reference letters for people who requested them. SB and MT: reviewers' names are mentioned in the book of abstracts. Perhaps a special recognition for those who do an extra large number of reviews. SB also suggests (echoed by others) reminders that even non-expert reviewers are needed and welcomed
- JCM: could pair expert reviewers with generalists in assigning reviewers. Offer incentives? e.g. 1% discount on conference registration per review? or discount on banquet ticket?
- JN mentions idea of having sub-chairs in specific subject areas (e.g. stylometry sub-chair); JF notes difficulty of coverage in this scheme.
- NF would like to convey substance of the conversation back to CCC in order to implement; JN notes that many of these have been implemented for 2015.
- CC asks about possibility of open peer review process. JN notes that Bethany was very close to doing open peer review for 2013, but the CCC resisted (and some others as well), on grounds that it is so much more difficult to express negative comments publicly. JF notes that this idea has come up often, for many years.
- EB notes that the problem of reviewers is common in fast-growing associations; she notes in particular the NLP community has been having trouble. Proposing a common pool of reviewers shared among related organizations. JN was conference chair for ACL conference, hasn't had the problem of people who commit and then fail to fulfill responsibility.
- PA notes challenges of budgeting for the TEI aspect of the proceedings preparation; tentatively, \$10K. Flag this as an issue for future conferences. FK notes that this year's conference developed DHwriter to facilitate the creation of TEI-encoded submissions. Used by 40% of papers. It facilitated the editing significantly. Formatting of the 60% of

remaining papers was done by hand and was very expensive, covered by the lab, CHF 40K. Rather stressful. JCM notes that the Hamburg abstract preparation was a nightmare; used professionals; would like to propose that ADHO throw some money at solving this once and for all: design a template-based system for long-term use, make it compulsory. KW agrees and corroborates, recalling at least \$10K worth of work. Problems of e.g. formatting citations, inconsistent ways of including images. FK: 2 pieces of software, open-source: DHWriter (which did help a great deal and will be mature enough for general use soon); also notes that the separation of the publicity aspect from the data archiving side (of conference information).

- JCM moves, KW seconds: Infrastructure committee be allocated a budget to commission the development of a robust system based on DHWriter, with a view to roll out for 2015 (aspirational) or 2016 (firm) for a compulsory abstract submission system. Ballpark: USD \$10K-15K, which would result in huge savings on the part of local organizers.
- Action item on Infrastructure committee: develop a plan to create a robust system based on DHWriter.
- SS asks about integrating this with confTool; JCM says that Harald Weinreich (confTool developer) is unwilling.
- OE amends to suggest: in 2015 we offer a discount to those who use it; 2016 make it compulsory.
- JM asks whether idea of having a printed book of abstracts (or having greatly shortened abstracts) is up for discussion. Notes that this is the only conference in his experience that continues with substantial abstracts. JF confirms that it has substantial citation value. Hence JM: could the Book of Abstracts be treated under ADHO publications framework? KW notes that the BoA does have an ISBN, for example.
- SB: there are communities where this is more standard (e.g. IEEE requires LaTeX publication-ready submission; Balisage likewise). Should think about renaming these from “abstract” to something more substantive, to acknowledge their significance as an important record of the work of the community.
- NF: Action on Publications Committee should consider how best to formalize the status of the conference proceedings as a better reflection of the scholarly work these represent.

MT-raised matters from PC2014 activity

- MT: notes great need for administration support (e.g. with ConfTool matters -- a lot of which could have been handled by a grad student or other admin help.) Esp. with a conference the size of ours, current workload is absolutely unsustainable. KW concurs that it would be very good to have some support to the chair. JF: could it be given as combination of recognition and payment? SB feels that probably better to have as a paid position. Further discussion of hourly vs. other ways of paying... SS: could handle this through the local organization since it's an investment of time and money (e.g., the role that Kevin Baumer has played in current conference)? Issues of timing. FK: need to avoid starting from scratch; having someone who does it from year to year. RS: when Sarah Schmidt did this work, it was borne as a local-organizer cost, which was comparable to the PC-paid expense to get ConfTool running.

KW moves: provide up to 1500 Euros of administrative support to the PC2015 chair and at the end of the year review how that has gone in order to determine a base amount for future years. Motion carries unanimously.

OE: do this for the remainder of this budget year (i.e. through December 2014). MT: the support is needed when confTool goes live, from September until reviews go out. SS: benefit if it could be the same person from year to year. (EB concurs, noting that many orgs use ConfTool.) RS clarification: where does the budget come from? Should be borne by ADHO. HS suggests that it may fit well into the CCC (and JN concurs, since CCC has to deal with reviewers, etc.)

NF: ConfTool improvements that have been suggested.

MT moves: CFP should go out only in languages that we can review in and that we permit presentation in. Motion passes unanimously JF and SB amend to decouple the outreach (in as many languages as possible) from the mechanics of reviewing and presentation.

Action: CCC needs to propose the addition of metadata field in ConfTool to represent the language of submissions.

Vote on ConfTool enhancements proposed by MT's PC2014 report.

- Include a metadata box for language of submission (covering the five supported languages) (moved and carried unanimously)
- Include a metadata box for languages that reviewers can review in, and an automated Paper-Reviewer matching mechanism (moved and carried unanimously)

Action: Chair of PC needs to liaise with Chair of Awards committee in late summer about Fortier Prize consideration and any other issues of shared concern.

1:00 Discussion of outcomes and next steps in strategic planning process (90 mins)

- **1:00-1:30: Discussion and decision for situating SIGs** (see Governance Group Recommendations, esp. "Satellite/nucleus model" and proposed revision Ad 1 under "CO feedback")
 - Suggestion: to allow flexibility in a SIG's "place of attachment" (whether CO or ADHO), as determined by SC
 - Place / time for SIGs to meet at DH conference
 - Earmarked funding for SIGs (entitlement vs. pooled funding; prioritization)
 - How to represent concerns and priorities of individual SIGs be represented to ADHO? New SIG SC liaison role? Additional duty for existing office?

Request for clarification on "SIG place of attachment": NF (quoting Bethany) notes that ACH had wanted to have its own SIGs, and ADHO's owning them seemed to subvert that desire. JF clarifies that this is an acknowledgement of the fact that different COs may have different needs. JN clarifies difference between Associate Org and SIG. SS asks about financial implications of ADHO attachment (which is clear when a SIG is attached to a CO).

NF observes that the SIG recruitment activity can happen at either level (ADHO or CO). JCM notes that having SIGs at ADHO level is counter to the concept of "special" interest group. Also observes that SIGs at the ADHO level, to a degree, compete with COs for ADHO's attention and funding; we risk creating a problematic structure that could backfire; prefers that we call these something like a "task group." NF observes that the SC could vet SIG proposals with these risks in mind. JN: SIGs are only open to members of COs; they don't receive structural funding. KW: in some organizations these are called "discussion groups" or something else that is benign and not risky. Discussion of which option should be the default (SS in favor of CO level; JN at ADHO level); rather than having a default, require a rationale in the proposal. SB: no assumption

of default funding ongoing; if a SIG wants ongoing funding, they can apply every year, or they can affiliate with a CO, or they can become a CO. OE: no problem for any CO to fund any SIG, no matter where it's attached; attachment and funding are two different things. JCM: we don't want to see a lot of SIGs spring up and then fade into inaction; one advantage of CO attachment is to have a liaison or advocate to prevent this happening.

SS would like us always to consider the stated desire for a "leaner" ADHO. JF notes that ADHO exists also to handle those things that are better handled internationally.

Motion: SIGs at time of proposal should decide where it wants to attach, and to make a rationale for attaching either to ADHO or to a particular CO, with the appropriate body reviewing the proposal. If such an attachment appears to be inappropriate, communication and collaboration would resolve. COs not required to adopt ADHO SIG mechanisms. Carries unanimously.

SB: Should there be earmarked funding for SIGs?

SP: because of budget implications, suggests that SIG applications need a deadline. GW notes that this may encourage many proposals at a time, which could be counter to ADHO desire; JN concurs, but notes that there is an expectation by SIGs that meeting venues, etc., be made available.

Motion: SIGs funded at the ADHO level have no entitlement to ongoing funding, but may apply for ad-hoc funding. Carried unanimously.

NF: presents SIG requests for meeting venues at DH conference. How does the SC feel about this?

JF notes that TEI allocates all SIGs a guaranteed pre-conference slot at the conference; OE likes this approach, but asks whether CO-connected SIGs would have the same assumed privilege?

JCM advises against it on grounds of scope; not practical. Recommends not burdening LOs with specific logistical problems: LO should have clear expectations of time slot, number of rooms, but not be expected to make all arrangements. SB suggests that this privilege should be limited; there are costs involved. PA notes that he's already fielding requests for many different meetings, so would prefer to deal with that in a general pre-conference slot. Question of catering and other arrangements; sounds complicated. JN would like to see proposals for SIG meetings go through the PC, as responsible for the scientific content of the whole conference, not as automatically approved meetings. MT notes that there were complications this year with SIGs who weren't approved by the peer review process. OE notes that these could be called business meetings. JF notes that SIG meetings are purely voluntary, and should not be peer reviewed -- not part of the scholarly program.

Motion: ADHO- and CO-sponsored SIGs should have the opportunity to request space for business meetings at the annual conference during the pre-conference period. Motion carries unanimously.

NF presents question of point-person on SC for SIG proposals, communication, presentation, liaison. Currently this has been the SC chair (which has been substantial work); perhaps designate a SIG liaison to advise on proposals, receive annual reports, communicate with SC about SIGs. JN notes the proposal for an "Organizational development & diversity" officer in the Governance strategy group that would fill this role. (This doesn't require a motion, at least until/unless the Governance proposals themselves are discussed and adopted.) HS offers that, for transitional period, the Admissions Committee could take on this role.

Motion from HS: as an interim measure, the Admissions Committee should be charged with the

role of SIG Liaison. Carried unanimously.

SS notes importance of a protocol for this officer, when the time comes.

- 1:30-2:00: Discussion of Funding Group Recommendations in order to constitute a "Treasurers' Working Group" that would be charged to:
 - Draft a statement on financial transparency
 - Model a shared, collaborative banking infrastructure for COs (including fundraising topic)
 - Model the finances of ADHO taking on OUP membership management functions
 - Model the ADHO assumption of DH conference finances
 - Model possible changes in subscription revenue based on consequences of membership-only, open-access, and other OUP proposed changes, taking into account ADHO's own political position with respect to open access

NF notes: all of the funding group recommendations require some financial modeling (cost analysis, potential revenue models, etc.) before we can make final strategic decisions. Hence proposal to create a Treasurers' working group" charged as above. Specific notes and discussion: JM: during strategic planning, there was thinking about how ADHO can be most efficient in providing fiscal infrastructure for COs. One idea; look at what financial and other benefits might arise if everyone were on a shared banking infrastructure. In February discussions, it was noted that there are some major obstacles to deal with; we would need to look at the different requirements in different locations that would prevent a central banking infrastructure from providing maximum efficiencies. HS: this would be a chance to investigate how best CO systems might interact; more of a financial network rather than a single infrastructure.

The modeling needed:

- operational implications: how would it work in practice?
- financial implications: what would it look like financially?

A working group is being tasked to do these three things (i.e. the modeling activities listed above); in addition, in response to Strategy group recommendation, the working group would also be charged with draft a financial transparency

Membership in this group: led by JM, and including all CO treasurers. NF asks PS to liaise between the SC and this group; JN notes PS's experience as role of Local Organizer as very important. (JM notes that other past LOs may be asked to contribute as well.)

Motion: commission a Treasurers' working group to include ADHO and CO treasurers plus Paul Spence to:

- Draft a statement on financial transparency
- Model a shared, collaborative banking infrastructure for COs (including fundraising topic)
- Model the finances of ADHO taking on OUP membership management functions
- Model the ADHO assumption of DH conference finances
- Model possible changes in revenue and other changing factors

This group should liaise with Treasurers of Associate organizations and others as needed.

Motion carries unanimously.

- 2:00-2:30: Discussion of Membership Group Recommendations and decision on the

following:

- ADHO will articulate its role as a supporting organization for COs
- ADHO will confirm the following categories for membership and affiliation: Organizational membership and affiliation; and Individual membership
- Representation of Constituent Organizations on ADHO governance bodies
 - One representative per Constituent Organization will serve on the Board.
 - Associate Organizations and Affiliate Organizations have no representation on the Board.
 - Committees will have no representation of COs.
 - Calls for membership on ADHO committees shall go out to and be distributed by COs
 - Mechanisms to allow individuals to express interest in being involved in ADHO activities, linked to an outline of possible activities, will be provided directly through the ADHO site and a tick box on the membership form.
- ADHO will be the sole means by which individuals will join Constituent Organizations, for collecting individual CO membership fees, and for disbursing funds to Constituent Organizations and others
- ADHO shall develop and implement its own individual membership management system and form
- ADHO will promote membership in ADHO's Constituent Organizations

NF recommends focusing on our "Alliance" identity, and to get away with the "umbrella" metaphor. PA suggests that we should see ourselves as a supporting organizations; this language is changed. JN has long favored a "federation," but acknowledges the importance of practical, pragmatic tasks that are best done jointly. JCM suggests that we distinguish between shared values and consensus around a common sense of purpose -- and those issues that need ways of special handling: controversial areas where consensus doesn't already exist. EB notes that ADHO really has more, however: conference, publications, a global perspective -- a much broader mandate than merely a support mechanism.

SB, echoing EB: need a statement that reflects a common sense of purpose that brings us together, beyond simple seeking of efficiencies.

Action on Membership Group to come up with a draft statement about ADHO's role (and to restate it from the first recommendation as documented).

JN: need a democratic structure where individual voices carry weight; likes the idea of a federation/alliance, but having the opportunity for different groups to evolve independently and have their own identities; hence likes the idea that individuals are members primarily of a single organization that they identify with.

JCM: not all at the same level of experience in ADHO and DH, internationally: for those who have been in the organization for a long time, the ADHO level and logic makes a lot of sense; but for those just coming in and trying to shape a new organization, it matters a lot to put the focus on the local; makes sense from a funding perspective and a constituency-building process. Need to be able to represent themselves as individual, not as part of a big undifferentiated ADHO organization. ADHO needs to serve a strategic function. (Notes the experience of EADH,

which is now a mini-ADHO, and thus has met some of these challenges.) Recommends not imposing an idealistic vision of ADHO on newly-forming organizations. Example: how to describe joint memberships -- something that makes sense to old-timers (as an expression of spirit of collaboration, joint support, etc.), but not at all to newcomers (who may not understand which organization they're joining). Suggests that joint membership (with an extra fee) would then result in an additional conference discount. E.g. a "supporting membership" in that additional CO.

Question of whether joint membership is something we want to incentivize or disincentivize

SB: Question of how membership gets represented: what do people perceive themselves as joining? this is an interface issue. Question of what rights accompany membership, so that people can make rational decisions. There should be an additional cost so that people use joint membership as intended, rather than doing it as an empty gesture. Perhaps also need an ADHO-level "membership" (e.g. "ADHO supporter"). A further issue has to do with counting: whether we have "primary" COs (going back to revenue distribution) or whether we distribute joint CO revenue evenly; there are financial consequences here. The London model was in favor of having individual COs having a single vote at the ADHO level rather than proportional representation (in which case the membership model would flow from that: joint membership would make sense in that case).

HS: Harold wrote a summary of joint membership and joint allocation of ADHO income, which is attached to one of the Admissions committee documents. Joint membership was originally a strategic decision when ADHO was formed. Following that trajectory, percentage of joint members has risen to 50% (despite there always being an additional fee). Didn't want to make joint membership mandatory or perfunctory. HS notes that even when the idea was first raised, although some people found it somewhat confusing, that doesn't seem to have remained a problem. ADHO creators wanted to create a flexible framework, not just another scholarly society. HS would not want to lightly throw out the idea of joint membership.

We now move this discussion into the parking lot...

2:45 Break [we bought ourselves an extra 15 minutes here!]

3:00 Bids for DH2016 conference: presentations, discussion, decision

1. 3:00 Kraków, Jan Rybicki and Maciej Eder
2. 3:20 Oxford, Sebastian Rahtz
3. 3:40 Roma, Fabio Ciotti
4. 4:00 UCLA, Willeke Wendrich
5. 4:20 Utrecht, Arjan van Hessen

5:00 Formal listing of decisions requiring ratification by COs (15 mins)

5:15 Adjourn for dinner

(Meet dinner bus at EPFL – Place Cosandey, 5:15-5:30. Scheduled departure time: 5:30.)

Tuesday, July 8 --- Swiss Tech Convention Center, room 2C

(Note different room from the Sunday meeting!)

Preliminaries:

JCM: Karina elected president of EADH yesterday; Voting reps from EADH: Arianna, Elena Gonzales-Blanco, Chris Meister

9:00 Matters remaining from Day 1 Agenda (45 minutes)

1. ADHO's involvement with the International DH Training Network (Ray, 15 mins)

RS: Ray was tasked two years ago with setting up a training committee, talked with current trainers, and launched questionnaire. Overwhelming positive response to coordinate. 67% interested in coordination of scheduling, curriculum, etc.

Proposing an ADHO-sponsored training working group to facilitate communication and collaboration (not necessarily imprimatur but some degree of support from ADHO).

Active thus far: those who are actively running training including Elisabeth Burr and the summer school at Leipzig, James Cummings and the Oxford Summer School, Claire Clivaz with training efforts in Switzerland, Jen Guiliano/Trevor Muñoz with HILT, also discussions with JADH

Discussion:

- PA: prospect of a supporting framework for communication is valuable; would help to lend support to good existing examples, beneficial for development of new training initiatives
- HS confirms with RS that GO::DH has also been involved in the discussions; in particular, looking for seed funds to assist members of the GO::DH community in attending training at conferences; some success there
- General consensus of support for this. The group will work on constituting a group and will report back next year.

2. Discussion of CCC proposal for archiving and accessing conference records (John Nerbonne, 25 mins)

JN provides detail of his CCC report (section 5)

- wants a sense of the SC's feelings on this
- some confidentiality issues
- some ethical bind: on the one hand, need to respect confidentiality that has been assumed or expressed in the past; on the other hand, there are people interested in social dynamics of what we do who would like access for research purposes.
- Research questions on issues like native command of English, gender issues, subdiscipline, etc. : clearly this would involve divulging information that would risk violating anonymity. At high levels of aggregation some summary statistics have been available, in a way that doesn't seem risky.
- Proposal to give people access to this data, but with specific requirements of data confidentiality, aggregation of data, would ask not publish substantial quotes, etc. People

would be asked to provide evidence of measures to protect anonymity.

- Want to ask the community about their feelings on this, rather than trying to anticipate all issues at the outset.
- Scott Weingart would be interested in investing some time in developing more of a system for making this data accessible.
- JCM: sometimes the local organizer has a data dump of everything from confTool, which could supplement data saved by ADHO. Also: this interfaces with the idea of archiving all of the publicly accessible records of conferences. We need to document the publicly accessible element as well. Naive to think that these old conference databases will remain accessible forever.
- SB: Would be good to have a single point of access to all conference abstracts. Acknowledges that this has been discussed frequently before; asks whether anyone has been active in this? JF: Notes that John Walsh mounted a prototype for this idea, consisting of several years. Recommends putting some money toward continuing with this efforts. SB suggests this would be well worth funding from current ADHO budget surplus. Several acknowledge the importance of this work as a corpus.
- OE: also intermediate between the open and closed material: statistics on things like gender distribution, needed in a timely way. The Awards committee needs e.g. to be able to compare gender ratios of award applications to the gender ratios for the conference overall
- RS: has talked with Victoria legal counsel, who advised that there was no way to give access to this information if we haven't notified people at the point of collection. Is there a geographic situation where we could place this data to avoid legal risk for ADHO?
- EB: concerning the material itself, if it was made open for research purposes, suggests that people from different disciplinary areas come together to turn it into a corpus that would be useful for more than just one area of study. Do it right from the start. JN responds: that would be a bigger effort but it would be an advantage to have it done in an appropriate way for future research efforts.
- GW: in the USA, there are institutional review boards for social science research; could go instead to IRB for advice rather than legal counsel, perhaps less conservative and risk-averse.
- JN: has not sought legal counsel at all; people have already taken and used this data despite the confidentiality of the submission process; has generally been well received. Not clear what the legal status of this is. Acknowledges that we are in the gray area with this sort of research.
- SS notes that what Scott did was clever: didn't see rejected proposals, but was easily able to infer from "bidding phase" which papers had been rejected. It doesn't seem clear that he violated any specific agreements as a reviewer, but some feel that he did push the boundaries of community expectations
- RS: in sympathy with the effort but still cautious with respect to legal issues.
- SS: having the perspective of social science would be helpful in advising on anonymization, statistical methods, etc.
- JN: NB article about how easily anonymized data can be de-anonymized by reverse engineering
- JCM: consider two different use cases: the historical data (which requires clarification) and the data henceforth (for which we should include an explicit clause in the bidding process and the review process so that all participants can say whether they agree to

having the data used for statistical analysis. Can obtain some expertise on this from social scientists. Another way would be to communicate with past contributors and seek authorization. Whether it's worth the hassle, and what the return rate might be, would of course have to be considered.

- JF: suggests asking current ConfTool account holders to agree to these conditions even for their past contributions.
- SS notes that this is clearly scholarship, and with very good motivations, so that we should be careful to pitch the idea thus, to avoid knee-jerk negative reactions and anxieties
- JF: we should also be clear what sort of research is being considered or allowed, to make sure that people worry as little as possible about "personal vectors of criticism", which seems to be the primary cause of anxiety. Even a low return rate would be useful -- although note that ConfTool doesn't even capture gender, so that would have to be added if we really wanted it.
- OE: even incomplete data would be useful for purposes of Awards Cmte.
- JF believes that even a 50% return rate could be used as a sort of seed to encourage others to agree to allow their data to be released. JCM concurs, even given the possible data biases, etc. We should distinguish categories and use cases, rank the problematicity of each area, etc. Examples of the wide spectrum of possible concerns, which should be addressed and analyzed, then tackled step by step.
- KF: in the interests of protecting ADHO from risk of perception that private data is being released, useful to have a thorough description of exactly what the data are and what will be done; experience shows that it's the personally identifiable data that is the trickiest, highest-stakes. People will want to know details of what they are agreeing to and it will help to articulate this.
- LS: worth being explicit about the expectations for reviewers about what access they have to private data; need an explicit privacy policy for ADHO. JN notes that the report suggests that we give reviewers a form expressing expectations about what they can do with the information (to cover the Scott Weingart case). He should have received approval from PC chair or CCC chair.
- NF: notes that even collecting the publicly available records will be difficult; the private records even more so. Asks for action items and processes. JN believes that we really should be conscious of liability; proposes talking (together with JCM) with legal counsel at DARIAH-DE project (specialist in transAtlantic issues in data access and management).
- Add two things to ConfTool: ask people to check off their permissions in confTool
- JCM: remember that ADHO is a legal entity registered in the Netherlands; thus Europe is the legal framework we need to consider. ConfTool data and future ADHO data is hosted in Germany.
- EB notes greatest interest in controversial material (gender, language, etc.). JN would like to set this more difficult set of questions aside for now, given its complexities. NF would like to take the problem one step at a time.

Action on CCC: seek legal counsel from DARIAH-DE lawyer

Action on CCC by August 31: we want to hear a proposal back within 6 weeks to change ConfTool

Action on CCC: by August 31 make proposal for compiling public material including costs for aggregating the abstracts; seek prior aggregation from John Unsworth and then designate someone (Scott Weingart?) to find any remaining conference abstracts that have escaped the net.

NF: Future action item: discuss getting legal insurance for members of this group soon, noting that there may be liability if we pursue many of these efforts further.

9:45 Voting on candidates for open SC positions (30 min.)

- *SC Chair: Paul Arthur, John Nerbonne*

PA expresses gratitude for his nomination, and its possibilities for extending reach internationally, etc. However, given his upcoming work (with aaDH, and with DH2015, etc.), and acknowledging his opinion that JN would do an excellent job, and the procedural importance of European incorporation, he asks us to support JN's candidacy.

RS asks for discussion of regional diversity and rotation of ADHO leadership. SS follows with request to discuss (off the record) the nominations for SC chair that had been made, but declined by the nominees. Acknowledgment that these nominees did include women as well as men.

AC asks how the nomination process works, since it's not an open call. NF notes that it was an internal call in the SC, nominations made to Secretariat, who then confirmed with nominees.

JN elected unanimously by anonymous written vote.

JN offers a few words in favor of including new communities, bring in a lot more people.

- *MLMC Chair: Alex Gil, Maurizio Lana*

AC notes that we might want to ask candidates (for future elections) to provide some sort of vision statement, so that we might get to know them better.

HS proposes the possibility of involving both candidates, perhaps one as a deputy chair. JF asks whether this would set a precedent (e.g., for having geographic diversity in the leadership, or for having co-chairs, etc.)

Maurizio Lana elected, with the suggestion of recruiting a deputy.

- *Awards Chair: Tanya Clement, Øyvind Eide*

Øyvind Eide elected.

- *CCC Chair: (post -election of JN as SC chair)*

Further discussion: JN leaves the CCC chair open. JN suggests the nomination of Claire Clivaz, who has already agreed to be considered.

NF, question about process: should we open up a formal nomination process, or do more immediate nominations as part of this meeting?

AC: would Claire also be the EADH representative on the CCC, or would there be a vacancy there? (This would be up to EADH.)

JN urges speed to fill the CCC chair role

RS notes the value of CCC chair having had experience with the conference from all sides.

JCM urges pragmatism given the urgency of filling this position. There was discussion in EADH meeting previous day seeking nominees, not a big pool; unlikely that we would identify many additional candidates over the next month. Preferable to move forward today.

KW agrees that we need to move quickly; could we take one more week just in the interests of broadening the pool, seeking someone who has more experience in the organization

SB, clarifying: we are talking here about finding someone to complete JN's term (i.e. two more years), not someone to start a new term.

PA: in some organizations, can co-opt someone to fill an opening rather than having a formal election

AC: would be fair to allow time to identify additional candidates.

NF: consensus on a short nominating period for one week from this meeting, followed by quick confirmation of candidates' willingness to stand, one week for discussion of candidates via email, and election within 2 weeks. Request 200 word vision statement from each candidate.

EB notes that the CCC is a complicated committee with a lot to do; good to consider someone who knows the organization and the history to facilitate transfer.

Decision to address "membership selection" strategy rather than governance.

11:00 Membership selection (Strategy process)

NF notes that the strategy process is a marathon, not a sprint: we should take as much time as we need to resolve the issues thoughtfully and completely

SB describes the question of which types of memberships and organizations we currently have, and where we're moving. In brief:

- Constituent Organizations
- Associate Organizations
- Affiliate Organizations

Mechanisms of joining discussion: issues include how much power and influence ADHO has over its own processes, how the processes look to those joining, and how the systems interact among themselves. Mockup membership form at London meeting, which headlines idea of "joining an ADHO organization" -- but subsequent discussion reveals that many are uncomfortable with this, and would rather highlight the joining of a "local" and known organization first, and *thento* be offered the possibility of joining additional organizations. We seem to be arriving at a sense of consensus at what sort of mechanism should be involved. Move toward a more intentional practice of joining a CO.

Skinning process will afford individual COs the ability to exercise fairly good control over currency, look and feel, language, other important issues.

Cost model being proposed should ensure that joining multiple COs entails a deliberate decision to affiliate, taking the connection seriously, but without imposing a prohibitive extra cost to those

who do want to express an affiliation with multiple COs for good reasons having to do with e.g. geography.

NF notes an ad-hoc group that has convened to discuss more: HS, JCM, SS and NF discussed other possibilities and vectors have arisen.

- JCM: have reached an even-handed consensus, looking at three perspectives people may have upon considering joining a CO (or multiple COs), all of which should be considered. Initial principle:
 - First, those with an “idealistic” interest for members of the community wanting to identify with the cause at large rather than CO compartmentalization.
 - Second, pragmatically: for individuals who have a concrete interest in operating in more than one CO.
 - Third, a complication particular to EADH because of its associate organizations (might also extend to other organizations in future): substructures require accepting that typically people who get involved at that level are at a different stage of identifying their position within the DH universe, strong interest in developing a regional identity.

A mechanism that seems to require a choice between either just being completely isolated or joining the entire universe may be alienating to this group. An interim solution described in an interface sketch by Stéfan Sinclair during an informal evening meeting offers a clear-cut, easily understandable way into the DH community at various levels. There is still some fine detail to be determined: how to make it accessible to young scholars interested in exploring a new CO community; these are not obstacles. Also the issue of people who do not wish to identify with any one CO (e.g. for ideological reasons or other reasons). This can also be accommodated within the evolving model. Thanks expressed to the members of the discussion that yielded this outcome.

- NF: results were possible because initial thinking was so clear
- HS: good if the committee could think about those who don't wish to have specific CO affiliation (hence doesn't want to vote or stand for election) but wants to benefit from whatever membership benefits are appropriate. SB clarifies: benefits are understood in current model as flowing from ADHO via COs, so this requires more thought
- HS further: with respect to ADHO-level benefits, helpful to distinguish between “engagement benefits” (e.g. conference discount) and others that have more to do with expressing agency (voting, standing for election)
- We need to imagine a “generic” ADHO membership that is not “joint” but equivalent to membership in a CO; a “generic CO” member to make clear that individuals are never members of ADHO directly
- SS: Wants to be sure that a few issues remain on the table: we now have 40% revenue coming from individual membership, which is a historic change. Institutional is still the majority, but it is clearly shifting. Current structure of disbursement from the membership is currently reasonable, in that it avoids the pressure for COs to compete.
- NF suggests that, because there will be financial implications in anything we do, we should approach first the membership model, then see what the financial implications of the changed membership model may be
- DB: need to consider what motivates people to join; for some parts of the community, it

has to do with conference attendance (and hence may fluctuate from year to year with conference location). Might be worth investigating with the membership which benefits are most important to people.

- Discussion of a survey of the membership to help refine our decisions.
- JCM notes that the original goals of joint membership are being preserved in a different form, shows mockup by SS which permits selection of membership level, print journal option, additional CO memberships with associated fee, and option to make a donation to student bursaries
- CM notes that it's rare to specify the goal of the donation (student bursaries)
- EB and JCM confirm that this mechanism could also work on the level of the regional associated organizations; NF notes that with this form, people start with a clear sense of what they are joining, and move from there into another membership, without specifying that one is "primary" and one is "secondary", but they start by expressing an intention to join a specific association.
- JN: a few additional advantages: knowing where our members are located (eliminating the "general members" category). Also question of whether there would be a single membership management place. SB responds: the idea was to have a single system but with separate skins that would appear on individual CO web sites but hooked in on the back end to a central system. The group is now working on getting the development costed out (and acknowledging that it could be expensive).. Also notes that people can still express multiple locations (since they can choose multiple CO affiliations)
- JM: has done some initial costing out, looking at third-party services. About \$1200 per year, can collect funds, do membership management, email subscriptions, tie into confTool, etc. Can be multi-currency via something like PayPal. Some are multilingual to a degree, but this could also be handled via the skin.
- JCM reports that the EADH treasurer has had different results; should compare notes. JM notes that he will be meeting with Paul Vetch; JCM recommends also involving Peter Gietz.
- Integration with ConfTool would be really terrific
- **Action on this ad-hoc group: to investigate options to develop and host such a solution, what they might cost, and which issues they would be able to handle (and where they might fall short).**
- **Action on SB to return to the Membership strategy group to discuss the implications of this new proposal on their original report, and to put forth concrete proposals in response..**
- JM: ADHO has always divided individual subscription money equally rather than proportionally; NF notes that this is now on the table for reexamination and should be part of the upcoming financial modeling exercise. SB notes that discussions so far have articulated the role of ADHO as facilitating cross-CO cooperation and support, not creating competition between COs. The group reaffirms this consensus.
- SB: notes recommendation from London meeting (membership group) that representation at the ADHO level be made non-proportional (1 CO = 1 vote), which obviously has large ramifications for what status a particular organization (SIG, AO, etc.) holds. This will require significant discussion to resolve. NF notes that this will be the next question for us to take up in the strategy process (and that it impinges on the Governance question).

11:45 Committee constitution for 2014-2015 (15 min.)

- Confirming (by stipulation) voting membership of ADHO SC 2014-2015
 - aaADH: - 1 member:
 - ACH: - 2 members:
 - EADH: - 3 members:
 - centerNet: - 1 member:
 - CSDH/SCHN - 1 member:
 - JADH - 1 member:
- Non-voting members of ADHO SC 2014-2015
 - Treasurer & Deputy Treasurer
 - Secretariat (review 2012 decision to have 2 secretaries)
- Naming of CO representatives to ADHO committees (mainly defer to email)

NF: reaffirming traditional representation for upcoming year, as indicated below. Notes also that COs differ in their approach in terms of representation (or even if they have terms).

SS: at ACH meeting previous day, it was noted that the members of the ADHO SC are not elected by the membership, and that different COs have different mechanisms for selecting their executives (who in turn are placed on ADHO SC).

NF: We might feel that it's the business of each CO to determine its own processes, but affirms that we should at least know what those processes are.

[HS and JCM, departing the meeting, wish to register their appreciation for NF's service as SC Chair.]

NF: Humanistica group (which is where HS and JCM are going) will be deciding whether, and as what, this international Francophone group wishes to do. Notes that, whatever their wishes, this would not be their decision.

NF: asks JM whether there's a need for a deputy Treasurer. JM notes that distribution of knowledge is always highly desirable, both in case of unavailability, but also future transition.

NF notes that, now that we're in charge of our own bank account, we should have another person (which JM says helps to insure accountability). JN and JM discussion of staggered terms, terms of office for Deputy. NF suggests waiting until the Governance discussion gets further along.

PA suggests that this policy of having a Deputy chair for all committees could be a good idea, although the situations are different. NF acknowledges the importance of this suggestion, but would still like to defer the suggestion until later Governance discussions.

NF: opens topic of formalizing the two-secretary system. Given current discussions on governance Proposes a one-year continuation of current policy, pending discussion of governance that would formalize these roles further.

Discussion of whether Secretary should be a voting position; concluded that we should remove voting rights from secretary position. **Motion: remove voting rights from position of ADHO Secretary; carried unanimously.**

12:00 Review of financial consequences of decisions made; reconciliation with budget

NB: This half-hour, during which the financial report was discussed, constituted a joint meeting of the SC and the ADHO Foundation Board. Foundation Board members Neil Fraistat, chair, Karina van Dalen, Secretary, and Jarom MacDonald, treasurer, were all in attendance.

JM, showing Google doc version of budget:

- looking at income distribution section, noting that as things currently stand, with the inclusion of 1500 Euros for administrative support of PC chair, and inclusion of proposal from Edward Vanhoutte concerning increased support for LLC from GBP 4000 to GBP6800, based on increased number of submissions, number of reviews needed, other administrative tasks: amounting to about 10 hrs/week of labor year-round, approximately 15 GBP per hour. Modest in relation to the work being done. Also note that DHQ receives an additional subvention from ACH, and EADH support for LLC is being discontinued (on expectation that support for LLC as income-producing journal should be from the ADHO level) so this brings LLC in line with total support received by other journals.
- **Motion to approve Edward Vanhoutte's proposal to increase LLC funding to GBP6800, carried unanimously.**
- **Proposal from Edward to publish 5 issues of LLC per year to be moved to future (email) discussion.**
- With these two proposals approved, the distribution is [as given in the budget]. Slightly lower than as discussed on day 1 of the meetings. This does not include proposal to subvent the creation of a system to produce the annual conference Book of Abstracts that was discussed (and voted on) on Sunday, though the amount is unclear. This difference has substantial implications for CO revenue. OE notes that this may result in a conference hosting profit, which could be returned to some hosting university, not to a CO or to ADHO (or even necessarily to conference attendees). PA notes, however, that not funding this proposal this year could have implications for the quality of the 2015 conference (where there is a particular lack of expertise in this area anyway). JN notes the European principle is to have about 25% of annual operating costs in reserve; current reserves are at about 50%.
- OE: might be possible to split the cost over two years, given that the timing is in any case so tight.
- **Proposal to have infrastructure committee prepare (and submit urgently) a proposal (of costs, timeline, etc.) that can be shared with the SC very soon, before moving forward.**
- JN wants to note for the record the perpetual difficulty of using TEI for these abstracts. Note offer from Michael Sperberg-McQueen to help develop a schema for the conference (though not a tool for editing / submission). AC recommends working closely with TEI-C for this work. PA notes that this work will have to be shared anyway, given dearth of TEI expertise in aADH territory.

Question arising from Sunday's motion on conference languages

JN request to clarify this motion: to include the word "**only**" in the original motion concerning clarification of conference languages.

JF suggests that discussion still needs to happen about question of how the language pool might be expanded, e.g., if JADH were to offer to provide pool or reviewers, with the aim of adding Japanese to the list of conference languages.

Action on CCC to come to SC with recommendation about how to include additional languages in future conferences.

12:30 Adjourn

NF thanks SC for intelligent, intense discussion over these two days of meeting.

JF thanks NF for his service during his two years as SC chair, to an acknowledgment with standing ovation by the SC membership.

Parking Lot issues not addressed during the meeting

Further strategic discussion (based on Governance Group Recommendations) (90 min.)

- Establish a satellite / nucleus organizational model
- Establish a Board of Directors-cum-Business Exec administrative structure
- Definition of Core ADHO Offices