Minutes: ADHO Steering Committee Meeting, 2015 (Sydney)

Sydney, June 28-29 2015

In attendance:

- Susan Brown (SB)
- Arianna Ciula (AC)
- Claire Clivaz (CC)
- Karina van Dalen-Oskam (KDO)
- Øyvind Eide (OE)
- Julia Flanders (JF)
- Neil Fraistat (NF, Monday only)
- Jarom McDonald (JM)
- Chris Meister (CM)
- John Nerbonne (JN)
- Masahiro Shimoda (MS)
- Harold Short (HS)
- Stéfan Sinclair (SS)
- Lisa Spiro (LS)
- Kay Walter (KW)
- Glen Worthey (GW)

_____

_____

SC Chair's list of action items and goals for 2015-2016:

- Sub-committee to develop protocols re: ADHO financial responsibility for conferences (Jarom, Claire, Paul Spence)
- Chair to look into desirability and possibilities for corporate sponsorship (JN)
- Infrastructure committee to implement new membership system
- Need a new proposal from Publications committee for disseminating results of conference (Leif Isaksen)
- Review and perhaps act on recent Pubs committee proposal [from John Walsh] to create a sustainable archive of conference results
- Need proposal from current Communications Chair (as outlined by outgoing Chair Lisa Spiro) about being more transparent to ADHO community (Hannah Jacobs)
- Need to figure out how to represent the SIGs at the SC level (e.g., with appointment of SIG liaison)
- Neil asked to bring the reform efforts to closure in the coming year, whether or not all proposals are actually implemented (Neil)

Other action items:

- CCC to develop a proposal for further development of the Convalidator, involving the Infrastructure Committee as needed, including consideration of how to get authorial conformance with formatting rules, etc., how much effort and cost to dedicate to copyediting and other QA processes, how to handle issues of inclusivity and the social aspects of the process, and how to integrate with ConfTool as part of the submission process. (Claire)
- Action item on CCC to develop clear protocols for inclusion and handling of sponsor presentations at the conference, based on experience this year with the Gale/Cengage presentation prior to the keynote. (Claire)
- Action item on CCC: propose revision to conference protocol to handle the question of limitation of coauthorship. The problem isn't co-authorship per se but rather having a large number of presentations by the same groups and authors. (Claire)
- Action: Neil's Governance committee to look at the issue of appointments to the Awards Cmte, and esp. CO (and SIG?) representation thereon. (Harold notes that is already included in the London documents, so this action item is more a reminder to Neil.)
- Action item: Communications chair to prepare a proposal for interaction between Research Data Alliance and ADHO. (Hannah Jacobs and John Nerbonne, already in progress)
- Action: John N. to inform John Walsh of decision to fund year 1 (Phases 1+2) of his DH Conference Abstracts proposal, and to revisit Phase 3 next year.
- Action on Stéfan: Inform Willard about current availability of funds in support of Humanist (noting that the Humanist budget has about 2 years of allocation still unspent)
- Identify a new ADHO Webmaster. Lisa and CM contact known potential candidates, if possible to be heard about on Day 2. (Lisa Spiro & Chris Meister)
- Action item on Admissions Cmte: Compose and send a formal declaration of intent to incorporate Humanistica as an ADHO CO at some point. Carried unanimously.
- Action on Stéfan: create a short current snapshot of the benefits of ADHO affiliation, for circulation to the COs and possibly beyond

Reforms-related action items:

- Governance group needs to define minimal requirements or norms for what should be a CO, what an AO, and what a SIG.
- Financial modeling of ADHO taking over OUP membership management functions (currently in-process) needs to be completed. JM, CM, and Paul Spence will meet to review these models before passing along to JN.
- JM and Treasurer's Group: create financial model for how non-regional COs would affect current funding distribution.
- JM and Treasurer's Group: Model the cost of hiring an executive director.
- Small group to meet in London in Fall, 2015, to take stock of, and restart, reforms process, especially governance. (JN, NF, CM, KDO, AC, others?)

_____

_____

SC Chair's list of decision items:

- Motion to accept Edward's Proposal for a 5th issue of DSH, with amendment to require that the fifth be dedicated to papers from the DH conference, and that it be free-access, starting with the results of DH2015. The SC may revisit this approval once the policies for publishing the results of this conference (currently under ongoing discussion in the Publication Committee) are finalized. Unanimously carried.
- Motion to retain the 9-member SC with the allocation of members as follows: EADH (3 members); ACH (2 members); AADH (1 member); centerNet (1 member); JADH (1 member).
- Motion that Comm. fellows be added to SC listserv, and that Comm. Cmte chair be responsible for oversight of their activities. Carried unanimously.
- Updating DH Conference Abstracts Collection: Motion to fund year 1 (Phases 1+2) of John Walsh's proposal then revisit Phase 3 next year. Unanimously approved.
- JF proposal on SC Secretariat approved: Always maintain 2 secretaries, for 4-year staggered terms, to turn over in December (rather than end of conference). Process identified and approved by consensus: to have a small committee (SC chair, immediate past chair, and remaining Secretary) to come up with nominees for SC voting and approval.
- Conference Coordinating Cmte Chair (nominee: Claire Clivaz); Claire is confirmed as CCC chair, starting after the DH2015 conference for a term of 3 years
- Membership Services Coordinator (nominee: Fabio Ciotti): Fabio is confirmed for a term of 3 years, beginning at the end of DH2015.
- Proposal: to have a SIG liaison attending SC meetings and on SC listserv, and to ask HS to present the two current potential nominees (Kathy Weimer and Roopika Risam) to the SIG conveners, and to return to the SC with a name (or names) to become SIG liaison.
- Infrastructure committee (nominee: Christof Schöch). Christof is confirmed.
- Leif Isaksen confirmed as new Chair of Publications Cmte.
- Communications committee Chair (already confirmed: Hannah Jacobs)
- Motion to accept Libraries & DH SIG proposal unanimously approved.
- Hosting of DH2017: Montreal
- Hosting of DH2018: Mexico City

Reforms-related decisions:

- Remove the following question from the Membership reforms, and relegate them to Governance reforms:** Consideration of "one rep per CO on Board (a.k.a. post-reforms SC)"** No more presumed "structural representation" of COs ("one rep per CO") on other ADHO committees.** Reconsider CO model so as to accept non-geographic member orgs (e.g., Humanistica) as COs; following on this, determine how to reconfigure current geography-based distribution of funds
- Motion and action item on Admissions Cmte: Compose and send a formal declaration of intent to incorporate Humanistica as an ADHO CO at some point. Carried unanimously.
- Reconfirmed: satellite / nucleus organizational model has been approved; board of directors + executive director model has not
- A follow-up face-to-face meeting to restart reforms process will be held in London, concurrent with an already-planned and funded meeting with OUP. Neil's travel to

London for such a meeting will be funded by ADHO; others will find their own funding.

_____

_____

Sunday, June 28 2015

1. Reports (9:00-11:15)

Chair's welcome (9:00-9:15, John Nerbonne)

Welcome and thanks to all for early arrival and dedication shown.

JN makes a general proposal to put items on the table and hand them off to committees, rather than focus on making concrete decisions.

Chair's report (9:15-9:45, JN)

JN reports progress on a number of fronts.

Chair's to-do list:

- Sub-committee (Jarom, Claire, Paul Spence) to develop protocols re: ADHO financial responsibility for conferences; need to have someone at the ADHO level taking responsibility for this.
- Self-assigned task for chair: look for corporate sponsorship, recognizing an increasing need for funding for ADHO. Should be prepared to take a loss once ADHO assumes responsibility for conference funding; JN would like to see about a year's budget in reserve. Asks for help of the SC in thinking through these issues.
- Infrastructure committee needs to find a way to implement the membership system
- Need a new proposal from Pubs committee for disseminating results of conference
- Need to review and perhaps act on recent Pubs committee proposal [from John Walsh] to create a sustainable archive of conference results
- Conference is still our primary activity; need to focus on preserving and disseminating our research results
- Need proposal from current Communications Chair (as outlined by outgoing Chair Lisa Spiro) about being more transparent to ADHO community
- Need to figure out how to represent the SIGs at the SC level: SIGS are a place to keep focus on research results and seriousness of our research (a place where JN has heard criticism)
- Asking Neil to bring the reform efforts to closure in the coming year, whether or not all proposals are actually completed. NF notes that he will discuss tomorrow the observation that the SC tends to be overloaded - something that makes progress difficult in larger questions such as the reform process.
- JN has noticed a certain degree of fatigue in the group lately (not exempting himself), even occasionally lacking quorum for a vote. Notes that some of the committees may be experiencing the same. All on the SC are doing double duty (on COs, etc.) - thus double

loyalties and double claims on our time. Not proposing a fix for this right now, but wanting to acknowledge the fact.

- Related: COs are sometimes reluctant to "let their people go" to service at the ADHO level. This is a challenge related to the governance structure. Not proposing a major overhaul, but would like to seek more efficient ways to handle our organizational overload. Notes that the SC is not well-enough known to the COs (who may see us as aparatchiki, issuing ukases, rather than colleagues). Convinced that we can govern more efficiently (even though also convinced that fundamental reforms are probably beyond our reach right now).

- Note that the "Domenico Fiormonte" observation of the "insider" nature of the SC is not without foundation. Proposes getting more people involved as committee chairs, representatives, etc. -- wants to bring in new people. NF notes that this criticism may be the result of our "federation" structure.

- KW notes that other have "open processes for volunteering" - would be a good practice for us. NF notes that this is a sub-sub proposal of the reform process. JN suggests that Fabio Ciotti as soon-to-be-confirmed membership services officer may be able to take this on.

- NF would like us to be more transparent (perhaps via the Comm. Cmte). SB agrees that lack of access to information about what we and our committees do is a likely cause for not attracting people, and for "black-box" impression that some have of ADHO. KW suggests that we need very brief list of communications responsibilities.

- HS agrees that making our annual reports public would be a good thing. In past, we've relied on public protocols were source of info., but brief descriptions would better serve.

- JF notes that we're too focused in this conversation on "plausible deniability" (i.e., responding "it's there in the documentation" rather than actually increasing transparency proactively. Proposes *outreach* (e.g., via Humanist posts) rather than *documentation* - pre-emptive posting, solicitation of comments, etc.

- OE: when people are ignorant of ADHO activities, it's not because they're stupid, but because we're not doing a good enough job of presenting our work. We need not just to post a 3-p. Awards cmte report, but a 1-para report that is disseminated

- OE: possibility of online meetings or public real-time engagement

- CM: some difficulty digesting all of the information that is already available; wants high-level summary of activities, ideally through something like a template that could be used to frame a regularly structured report. Recognizing reports may not be enough. EADH has all its reports online; hasn't analyzed click rates, but suspects that they're not popular! Too much white noise out there.

- JF proposes thin bandwidth invitation for people to be involved, not creating lots of extra reports but making solicitations of involvement highly visible.

- LS notes that current website does allow individual accounts to be created, so that more engagement is already possible. When someone new follows the ADHO Twitter acct., an automatic response is generated; NF suggest that this could include an invitation to review our reports, volunteer, etc.

- SS: need to be more proactive about sharing information; having ADHO be a misunderstood black box may not be as bad as it seems, since if it were more present and visible the confusingness of the relationship with COs would be more apparent; better to have COs be the most visible part. ACH uses a regular newsletter as a form of outreach. ADHO should be leaner, make COs visible as the interface for members.

- JN agrees that we need a leaner, more efficient organization at the ADHO level.
- ADHO General meeting on Friday: JN asks that each ADHO SC member be prepared to speak at the AGM; JF suggests that there are too many of us to do this during that half-hour; proposes instead a Q&A session, to allow people to speak. JN agrees, will make a brief plan for committees and COs to make a brief statement.

OUP report, 9:45-10:30

- JN reporting on behalf of Victoria Smith and Edward Vanhoutte.
- Things are going quite well; more subscriptions (incl. institutional) are coming in.
- There was an interaction with OUP and Edward that led us to understand that there's some confusion at OUP over whom they should be communicating with.
- CM: OUP was communicating on 2-3 channels concurrently, not clear who was in the discussion; ADHO approached Victoria Smith to clarify:
  - for business information, interact with EADH as the owner of the journal and the contract partner.
  - For anything related to content, journal editors are the point of contact.
- A fall meeting is being planned, face to face, with Karina, John Nerbonne (maybe), Chris Meister, Arianna, to discuss issues: membership administration and others
- CM notes that DSH is a small aspect of OUP's work, and that OUP (and Victoria in particular) is very responsive to our requests. One example of this is the way they handled the title change.
- CM notes decline in individual subscriptions to DSH this year, although the numbers in the current year's report may be misleading
- CM reminds us that the individual subscription numbers may be of concern for what they tell us about overall interest; need to treat this as a concerning symptom of larger change; may translate later on into a drop in institutional subscriptions. Important to keep DSH attractive to individuals and in keeping with evolving subscriber needs and interests
- CM reports on financial agreement re: 2014 conference volume of DSH: OUP increased its prices overall (across the board) by 5%; there are additional costs for the extra volume; solution is to take a shared approach. Resisting an increase to individual subscriptions; instead, offloaded the increased cost onto institutional subscription; also suggested that ADHO invest into the journal; 50% of the cost of the extra issue would be borne by ADHO. This represents a 3% reinvestment rate by ADHO; notes that this is a low re-investment in the journal
- It would be desirable to consider how we would handle another ADHO revenue stream (in terms of reinvestment, other policies); it would be good for us to think of the journal as an instance of a genre that might increase in scope, rather than as a special case.
- JM: notes that there have been some very complicated communications with OUP, e.g., regarding DHd subscriptions, and what information and monies goes directly to ADHO (e.g. Treasurer), and what goes through the COs.
- KDO notes another problem: 2-year backlog in publication
- SB expresses concern with Editor's note of dropping standards in peer review. Suggests that more rigorous peer review increases burden on reviewers. Complementary problems that need to be addressed together. JN notes that Edward is editor-in-chief, and thus has real influence on editorial operations. SB wants DSH to represent "the very best work in the field," not "just okay."
- CM notes that the short paper category in DSH is of particular concern, which has an

excessively long turnaround time. This particular category attracts younger scholars, and thus should have the most efficient. Notes that increasing rigor of peer review is the wrong way to address this particular problem.

- JN: It's clearly the sense of the SC that it supports Edward in his desire to maintain the highest quality possible for DSH.
- Discussion of Edward's proposal to have a 5th issue: OE notes that making the conference issue the 5th will not help the DSH backlog problem.
- CM: the fifth issue should be an open-access issue. In current discussions with OUP, proposal is that there be explicit language in the contract specifying that the fifth issue be freely available (based on the idea that this 5th issue is partially funded by ADHO's reinvestment in DSH); this would help keep DSH attractive in the context of increasing emphasis on Open Access.
- KDO: worried that even if we get a fifth issue, we may then need a sixth and a seventh in the future; need to think at a more basic level about the larger goals being served. Worries that this question will occur year after year. A fundamental mismatch in the amount of money we have for DSH, and the clearly increasing demand. Suggests we may want to postpone this proposal.
- SS notes that backlog seems inevitable; and that quality issue is a separate one. Just because reviews are positive, Edward should have a stronger editorial voice in rejecting submissions. DSH doesn't necessarily have to keep pace with everything published/ "accepted" by peer reviewers.
- CM suggests that we need a strategic overall view of the ADHO publication landscape, not just DSH. But even within DSH, we should be strategic: this "free 5th-issue" is proposal is something that we should accept as part of the strategy. Deal with the backlog issue separately, and not confuse the two. Wants the 5th issue to be based on "best of conference" idea, and to explicitly make it free access.
- JF notes that we need to take a structural approach separate from the 5th issue problem: ADHO can't currently afford to continue DSH publishing everything that the profession produces, but …
- Motion to accept Edward's 5th issue Proposal, with amendment to require that the fifth be dedicated to papers from the DH conference, and that it be free-access, starting with the results of DH2015. The SC may revisit this approval once the policies for publishing the results of this conference (currently under ongoing discussion in the Publication Committee) are finalized. Unanimously carried.
- SB notes that in committing to the 5th issue, we're still not taking on the larger possibility of entertaining other strategic approaches to the publication landscape. Will this forestall further thought and discussion?

Break 10:30-10:35

Treasurer's report (10:35-11:15, Jarom McDonald)

JM reports:

- There is a more granular proposal to come on ADHO financial responsibility for conference. Will clarify what will be LOs and ADHO's separate responsibilities. JM hopes to have it ready to be implemented for DH2016, but if not, then for DH2017,
- Refers us to the brief report; shows 6 slides as even briefer report.

- Income from OUP continuing to increase steadily. (Note that reporting is now in Euros, since we're now a Euro-based organization.)
- Sources of income: the proportion from institutional sources is increasing; the number of individual members overall is increasing but the income from individual members is decreasing. (Note that this "individual subscription" category from OUP includes the non-subscription, membership-only option.)
- Repeats CM's comment that we need to be attentive to individual subscriptions; they have symbolic value
- NF: we have assumed that OUP income will diminish over time and we need to find other sources, but in fact OUP income is still increasing; what is our projection/prediction here? JM says we can't tell at this point: we keep changing the parameters from year to year so it's difficult to project over time. Just because it's "always" looked like this doesn't mean that it will continue. Apparent plateau may or may not be ongoing.
- HS notes that OUP does us a real favor the way they do consortial journal bundling. Believes that we're in good shape thanks to this arrangement.
- JM: Real source of concern is that our costs and aspirations may be growing faster than our income does.
- Generally speaking, different COs contribute differently in terms of institutional and individual subscriptions.
- OE clarifies that subscriptions from Associate Organizations are not included in these numbers. JM notes that going forward, we will have to figure out how to account for these AO memberships. SB asks for clarification about AO subs. JM describes: DHd reports its memberships to EADH, who reports to JM, who passes the information and money to OUP. CM notes additional problem that length of time for communication leads to late delivery of journal subscriptions. HS notes that this is an interim problem, until we have our own membership solution in place; OUP is happy for us to gather all the data and money ourselves, then to report and pay annually.
- NF and CM: Fabio Ciotti is at the center of a solution to this problem, prior to a full implementation of new membership management solution. (Fabio is membership officer for all three organizational levels: ADHO, EADH, and AIUCD)
- Expenses: NB that our annual budgeted expenses are much higher than our actual expenses (by a margin of about €10K)
- Distribution of income: the proportion distributed to the COs has varied since 2005; 2014 saw an unusually low distribution to COs, because of convalidator development project and because of ADHO taking on expenses for DSH (formerly paid by EADH). In 2015, the distribution to COs is projected as going back up to 37% (the same as in earlier years). JM notes that this is also partly a matter of appearances: when there are expenses that must be paid (either by COs or by ADHO), we generally choose to have ADHO pay these, which raises the ADHO proportion.
- Proposed 2015 disbursements to COs, not reflecting the Associate Organizations. [Include slide numbers]
- CM notes that AOs are putting pressure on EADH to receive portion of membership-only income that is raised thanks to those AOs. This is particularly difficult for AIUCD. Difficult to do currently, since the CO doesn't know how much of its income comes from AO, and how much it can distribute back to AO. JM notes that we should take a strategic view of how important it is for ADHO to support the smaller AOs financially, and make explicit decisions on how to redistribute income.

- AC asks whether EADH income includes invoicing of OUP. JM notes that all invoiced income is already accounted for. Also: OE notes that this is a major-prize-free year (no Busa, no Zampolli prizes this year).
- JM recounts the way institutional subscription income is distributed: geography of institutional subscribers distributed to 5 geographic COs; everything is counted as "rest of world" (969 paying subscriptions, plus 1000+ free subscriptions). Gross amounts of joint memberships and "rest of world" institutional subscriptions are distributed evenly.
- CM clarifies that individual members are not accounted for anywhere in current system -- and that this will change in future system because of both new accounting and new ADHO+ membership category.
- JN notes one possibility for handling AOs such as AIUCD: just charge them the amount of money required to be members, and let them keep the rest, rather than taking all the money and returning remainder.
- JM notes that "rest of world" members are already being subsidized. Those who are paying for subscriptions are already paying "more than their share" (by design -- since they also receive the journal). JM: the diff between the membership
- HS would like to separate the concept (coming up with a figure low enough for anyone to pay, yet enough to make an actual contribution to ADHO funding) from the financial practice (how that is managed financially). Suspects strongly that money won't end up flowing many different directions, but rather as JN suggests above. HS notes that the figure of 50% fee for AOs could be about right, although still in limbo.
- SS asks for centerNet income. JM notes that only "center" subscriptions go directly to centerNet (which doesn't receive a geography-based distribution). HS offers historical note on this practice.
- Motion to accept the Treasurer's report: carried unanimously
- Motion to retain the 9-member SC with the allocation of members as follows: EADH (3 members); ACH (2 members); AADH (1 member); centerNet (1 member); JADH (1 member).

Conference reports: DH2015, DH2016 (11:15-11:30, Local Organizers)

Report from 2015 Local Organizers; Paul Arthur reporting on behalf of DH2015 hosts and PC2015, and Jason Ensor reporting on DH Convalidator

- Last year, ADHO approved use of funding for conversion of XML from abstracts, building a system that could be reused and would not burden local organizers with this task
- Software was developed by Marco Petris with Chris Meister; successful outcome; bugs have been fixed
- Software was not ready in time for a real-world trial involving individual conference authors using it to do their own conversions; also, conference budget already included copy-editor fees. From conference budget, a modest amount dedicated to pay Marco to develop a new feature: "super-admin" type control.
- Jason used this feature to transform the abstracts (after copyediting process)
- PA notes importance of copyediting; paid about AUD$10K . Notes massive task of copy-editing 300K words.
- First conference where proceedings are not available in print at all; only as a searchable online archive, published from XML. Several interesting new features, allowing several

types of navigation of conference program and abstracts in many practical ways.

- JN asks for recommendation as to whether we should continue using DH Convalidator. Jason does recommend this, as a great improvement over previous systems. PA notes time pressures, etc., that prevented a full trial, and also the local needs and processes will always affect implementation -- but in future, there will be a need for some human effort in rechecking, correcting data, based on expectation of human error on the part of authors. A certain number of abstracts will always fail to parse and require editorial intervention; this time ca. 40 abstracts. PA suggests that more people should be asked to use the template for initial submissions, moving the work up-front; asks how this may or may not integrate with ConfTool.
- CM (as Infrastructure Chair): notes social aspect to expecting participants to play according the rules of a template-based input. Decided to allow people to submit in most common formats (.doc and .dot), which accounted for 80+% of submissions.
- Program committee can decide whether to be stricter in the future about requiring authors to use the template provided; and prohibit application of unusual templates. Perhaps need some automatic checking to flag non-conforming documents.
- CM advises against copyediting; rely instead on the community to do a better job of creating accurate content. Says it should not be too much to ask the community to submit based on a template, which is a bare-minimum requirement for most conferences.
- PA notes the importance of copy-editing in order to encourage community inclusivity (and non-native English, etc.)
- JF proposes moving this to a separate discussion, with many implications and difficult decisions.
- PA concludes that Convalidator is a brilliant tool, and highly recommended
- JN notes that both the Infrastructure Cmte and the CCC will have to be involved. Also notes complaints about the speed (responsiveness) of the system (for conference participants wanting to read abstracts), and some wanted a printable version.
- OE notes that this is also a question of inclusivity; SS: also Publications Cmte
- CM adds for future discussion: distinguish between "true copy-editing" and "mere stylesheet" issues -- latter make up the vast majority of problems. "True copy-editing" is affected by inclusivity and other community issues.
- JF proposes a way forward: if the complexity is "how to involve all the groups that need to be involved," then we have to start with an explicit assignment to someone (whether Infrastructure, CCC, or other). Thus:
- Action on CCC to develop a proposal for further development of the Convalidator, involving the Infrastructure Committee as needed, including consideration of how to get authorial conformance with formatting rules, etc., how much effort and cost to dedicate to copyediting and other QA processes, how to handle issues of inclusivity and the social aspects of the process, and how to integrate with ConfTool as part of the submission process.
- PA presents DH2015 overview. Used professional conference organizing agency ("Conference Design") for both the two years of planning and implementing conference. Would have impossible to organize only with university; much cheaper to hire the agency. Thanks for strong support from Dean and senior management, in spite of having a lot of turnover in top administration. Great number of MOUs between State Library and other professional organizations and networking opportunities. Conference has provided lots of great visibility for DH in the area (both Australia and across Asian Pacific). Notes

crucial costs of full catering (by far the largest expense category), required by hosting on a campus. Have kept reg. costs to the bare minimum, even though Australia is known as one of the highest-cost places to host a conference. Suggests that ADHO assumption of financial stewardship will still require ADHO to be flexible in working with local conditions, e.g., it may be necessary for local hosts to contract with conference organization services, even if ADHO provides a lot of assistance.

- Registration numbers: ⅓ Australia (160) and ⅔ International (320), total of 480. (See PA's support to be submitted.
- Major sponsorship by Gale/Cengage and ProQuest. PA notes some initial uneasiness about this commercial sponsorship, incl. sponsorship of opening keynote (and sponsor presentation). Notes that this sponsorship was absolutely essential fiscally. Sponsor is an academic publisher (thus relevant to the scientific program). Suggests that this practice may be continued. PA consulted with PC chair on how best to allow representation of corporate sponsor, and decision was made to be very clear with where the sponsor is located in program, and how presented. (e.g., decision to put it front and center, rather than more "hidden" as sponsor of short paper sessions.
- JN acknowledges discomfort in corporate sponsorship, but also the absolute need for sponsorship for this particular conference. Believe that this sponsor demanded quite a lot. (PA notes that some universities may have local rules about how a corporation can be presented on campus.)
- Action item on CCC to develop clear protocols for inclusion and handling of sponsor presentations at the conference, based on experience this year with the Gale/Cengage presentation prior to the keynote.
- PC2015 results (presented on behalf of Chair Deb Verhoeven). Notes excellent relationship. Overall paper acceptance rate of 69% (excl. workshops). More details in PC chair's report.
- CCC and Claire (reacting to PC Chair report) presents question for limiting number of co-authors (rather than just limiting number of submissions allowed). JN notes that PC was charged with presenting a good program, including in particular a program of varied authors and groups, and was asked to come back with a proposal. AC and JF note that the PC is somewhat limited in what it can do regarding multiple submissions. HS clarifies: if we're going to offer guidance, then we should be explicit about what we are restricting, and what we are demanding of the PC.
- Action item on CCC: propose revision to conference protocol to handle the question of limitation of coauthorship. The problem isn't co-authorship per se but rather having a large number of presentations by the same groups and authors.

Maciej Eder reporting on behalf of DH2016 hosts:

- Conference theme proposed: "Digital Identities: the Past and the Future."
- Dates: July 11-16, 2016 (with excursions on July 16, Saturday)
- Submission deadline, November 1 2015; notice of results, Feb 7; deadline for workshop submissions, Feb 14.
- Number of expected participants: probably quite high because of difficulty of travel to Sydney; prepared for about 850 but could host up to 1200. Minimum break-even number is 400.
- Issue for SC to consider: should there be a limitation on the total number of participants? Do we want to let the conference become arbitrarily large?

- with respect to parallel sessions: in Lausanne, 10 parallel sessions; in Poland, can accommodate up to 15. But the SC needs to decide whether this is desirable.
- Maximum workshops: up to 20 workshops.
- Prebooked 800 hotel rooms.
- Providing free lunch included in registration fee
- 2 excursions are planned
- Satellite events, pre-conference workshops and other events (e.g. microconference from CLARIN, COST action for e-lexicography, Ray Siemens microconference on Innovations in DH Pedagogy). There is space for these but the question is how many we want to accommodate. JN clarifies existing policy: LO is free to accommodate satellite events (not including workshops and tutorials submitted to the PC for selection) before or after the conference at their choice.
- PA notes that this is a very important issue for LOs, e.g., the public event at DH2015 includes media interest, additional attendance etc. But these all require more effort for LOs, in addition to benefit.
- CM advises against combining such events at the administrative level; important to keep funding support separate and then the accounting also requires that expenses be clearly separated. Also has consequences concerning ADHO's responsibility for the conference: make clear that satellite events don't fall under this sphere of responsibility. However, it's fine to publicize these things together with the conference.
- JN notes that this advice makes it better for LOs, who should feel empowered to say no to any proposals that seem undesirable. PA concurs: some satellite events are painless and helpful, but others can be painful and risky. CM notes the problem of those who *only* want to attend their own meetings, not the main conference.
- Maciej notes the problem of not having a Book of Abstracts is a new concern for the LOs. Potential issue of citability; PA notes however that the digital abstracts are citable although it doesn't have a DOI or ISSN. Maciej proposes a "how to cite" feature for abstracts.
- Manfred Thaller (PC2016 Chair) will be proposing a stricter enforcement of the existing limits on number of submissions per person. He also plans to require fewer reviewers per proposal (generally 3); and to increase the number of proposals assigned to each reviewer (as many as 10 per reviewer had been proposed, but 6 seems more likely); the PC will discuss this tomorrow. JF notes that this issue is in the PC chair's purview, and that these numbers are self-limiting.

2. Committee reports & discussion (12:00-1:30, including lunch break)

CCC

- CC: Thanks to Bethany for preparing the report.
- JN summarizes issues: confidentiality, type of copyright asserted, language of submissions (note this is related to MLMC).
- AC notes: need for conference bidding far in advance, given lengthy process; should disseminate this information widely.
- CCC strongly supports the Publications proposal re: DH Abstracts
- SS asks that LOs be encouraged to make their budgets available to potential hosts. JN notes that, at least after ADHO assumption of responsibility, this data will become ADHO's anyway.

MLMC

- JN summarizes report from Maurizio and Alex
- treating internationalization of language as "localization"; hoping to find young volunteers to do the work
- also technical issue concerning how to handle translation of the web site
- seeking to make this committee more bottom-up.
- co-chairship of MLMC seems to be working very well, and to be serving the communities we want to be served

Awards

- ØE notes that we will make selection for two local prizes: the CAA prize (http://dh2015.org/caa-australia-prize/) and the Anthem prize (http://dh2015.org/anthem-press-prize/)
- Issue of representation: we now have a requirement that each COs can appoint a rep to the Awards committee (and may also decline to appoint a representative), even the smaller COs; on the other hand, SIGs cannot appoint representatives. Do we need a more flexible system? Awards committee may be a special case requiring broader representation. JN asks about the possibility of co-opted members, whether that would be a solution. OE indicates that we may need a broader clarification of whether committees draw only on CO representation or on broader representation from SIGs and other kinds of organizations. CM notes that this is actually a broader question that affects all committees; need to consider whether committees should include representation from SIGs. For the long-term, this is a question for Neil's proposed governance reforms, but in the interim, committee chairs should be reminded that they are free to co-opt members beyond the CO representation.
- Action: Neil's Governance committee to look at the issue of appointments to the Awards Cmte, and esp. CO (and SIG?) representation thereon. (HS notes that is already included in the London documents, so this action item is more a reminder to Neil.)
- SS notes that the Lisa Lena prize (awarded to the joint CSDH/SCHN + ACH conference this year) was very successful and greatly appreciated by both recipients and the community. OE notes the blog posts of both recipients.
- SS asks about travel bursaries: OE confirms that application numbers are not in fact down; simply, we're unable to fund all 60 applicants (as this past year). JN notes that this is a fundraising opportunity, but will need help dealing with it; SS has sent names of potential helper.

Communications

Two questions:

- Could communications fellows be members of SC listservs, to be more aware of discussions? JN suggests that someone (maybe the Communications chair) would need to sign off on communications to make sure that information doesn't get shared inappropriately. SB notes that CSDH has done this with success. Someone should take on the role of assuring appropriate confidentiality; JF suggests that the chair of Comm. Cmte should be that person.
- Motion that Comm. fellows be added to SC listserv, and that Comm. Cmte chair be

responsible for oversight of their activities. Carried unanimously.
- Action item: Communications chair to prepare a proposal for interaction between Research Data Alliance and ADHO.

Infrastructure

CM presents report (and makes a proposal):

- See report on the agenda.
- Convalidator development was single largest expenditure, € 13480 / USD 15.000
- Additional conference organizers have also expressed interest in using the convalidator; CM suggests that we make the Convalidator available for anyone to use via its web interface. Whatever has been done on this effort should be openly available to all who want to use it. We should treat the Convalidator as services to be used.
- Need to publicize this wider availability
- JN asks: maintenance costs? CM: the IC would need to consider this.
- Budgetary requirements for next cycle (for all infrastructure, not Convalidator) are €12K, about 10% of ADHO's total income. IC proposes that ADHO dedicate these funds for the next year, and extend our contract with the hosting company and systems administrator. Note that the allotment is a retainer for 16 monthly hours of SysAd work
- SS notes how difficult the tasks of the Infrastructure Cmte were, and how nimble and effective in responding.
- Motion: to approve expenditure proposed on p.5, para. VII of report for concrete figures and line-items, totalling €12K. Unanimously carried
- Second proposal: Issue of shared member and finance administration solution. A few possibilities were investigated, then a spec sheet / feature request, resulting in report to SC. Treasurers, John Unsworth tasked with formulating a proposal. CM started negotiating with Wild Apricot (system used by TEI-c), but concluded that it doesn't do what we need it to: for multi-lingual context, and for multi-line financial structure. Got quotes from a recommended consultant for costs to adapt Wild Apricot to ADHO needs: $18K figure was deemed excessive. Then CM contacted OUP to ask their solution: they use a hosted commercial subscription-management service subscription. Conclusion: this will be the single most time-consuming activity for the next year.
    - Asks SC to decide how much it is willing to invest in this effort, warns that it will cost more than the Convalidator (which seemed to some to be too expensive). Would like to ask JM to make a recommendation as to how much we can invest in this; JM notes that it will mainly affect the CO payout.
    - SS notes that ACH voted to dedicate some funds to skinning this solution, which could provide another decentralized solution: localized pages and transactions managed at CO level will enact the "localization" need.
    - CM notes that this distributed solution is completely different than current thinking: also possible, but far from current efforts. All COs would have to run its own software, money transfer, etc.
    - HS notes need to support fledgling COs.
    - NF notes possibility for immense complexity.
    - SB notes that we've long known of the complexities of banking systems and language, but that we can benefit memberships and groups in useful ways by taking this on centrally: scale will make a real difference.

- ○ JF, re: hosted solution that may meet the criteria; is there any use in circulating the call for proposals?
        - ○ CM: more publicity probably won't help, as many have already proposed e.g. Drupal add-ons -- but all of them fall short.
        - ○ JM spoke with other academic orgs, who all experience the same problem, e.g. Int'l Ass'n of Language Teachers invested $22K for a Drupal extension, which ended up not working after all.
- • Third proposal: to appoint Christoph Schöch as Chair, in place of CM, who is stepping down (but will remain on committee until membership solution in place).
- • JN (and entire SC) thanks CM and Infrastructure Cmte for very difficult work, done extremely well.

Publications

(includes proposal for DH Abstracts)

JN presents proposal from John Walsh to gather, archive, and present DH abstracts from the past into a single, unified

JN makes argument that it is our professional organization to protect its scientific output, thus strongly arguing in favor in principle.

OE proposes sending it to Infrastructure Cmte, because it is important, but not urgent. Not enough time to have read it.

SS notes the difficult thing is that it needs to be done. John Walsh has demonstrated his ability and dedication to the task, etc., in spite of the fact that it's a large amount of money.

JF suggests that this may be appropriate as a grant proposal, e.g., for an NEH ODH startup grant. Discussion about whether it is likely to be fundable, appropriate for NEH, etc. Consensus that it may be so,

JN summary of discussion: We are interested, and hope to see it done, would welcome seeking of additional funding sources (JF volunteers to work with Walsh on such a proposal). Proposes funding first 2 phases.

SS notes that this project has been in discussion for a very long time, and it's important not to slow it down.

Motion to fund year 1 (Phases 1+2) of John Walsh's proposal, then revisit Phase 3 next year. Unanimously approved. Action: John N. to inform John Walsh of this decision.

AC asks about Willard's request (in Pubs report) for Humanist support: what is the amount requested? Unclear. SS and JM clarify that Humanist already has 2 years of allocation unspent (from both ADHO and ACH?), so he may have more available than he knows.

Action on SS: Talk to Willard about the availability of funds.

3. Committee and officer appointments (1:30-2:30)

Non-voting members / officers of ADHO SC 2015-2016

- **Deputy Treasurer** (no current nominees)
- Discussion of potential duties of this position: JN notes importance of tracking ADHO conference funding model, this role could be folded into conference funding task.
- **Secretary**, incl. new proposal for terms and rotation (no current nominees)
- JF proposal: Always maintain 2 secretaries, for 4-year staggered terms, to turn over in December (rather than end of conference). Process identified and approved by consensus: to have a small committee (SC chair, immediate past chair, and remaining Secretary) to come up with nominees for SC voting and approval.
- JN expresses appreciation for Julia's service as Secretary in anticipation of her December end of term. The assembled body strongly concurs.
- **Webmaster** (no current nominees).
- AC: question of remuneration? JM notes that there is a budgeted opportunity for a 1200 Euros annual stipend. SS notes that we may want to consider this as part of Communications fellows. LS notes that this is rather different from current "public awareness" functions of fellows. OE notes that this may be a welcome job for GO::DH person, though no one is identified.
- Discussion whether e.g. Drupal updates are done by this person, or by Ian as SysAdmin. CM suggests possibility of EADH web editor (currently paid €1500 per year) as extending his duties to ADHO. Much discussion that this role needs more definition, and perhaps requires an open call. CM notes at least 3 tiers of responsibility: back-end, middle, and front (content).
- JN proposes that Lisa and CM contact known potential candidates, if possible to be heard about tomorrow.
- **Conference Coordinating Cmte Chair** (nominee: Claire Clivaz); Claire is confirmed as CCC chair, starting after the DH2015 conference for a term of 3 years
- **Membership Services Coordinator** (nominee: Fabio Ciotti): Fabio is confirmed for a term of 3 years, beginning at the end of DH2015.
- **SIG Liaison** (proposed new role; possible nominee: Kathy Weimer): Proposal to ask HS to discuss with Kathy and other SIG conveners. Discussion as to whether it's necessary to have SIGs designate a liaison, or to have SC name one itself. SS notes that Roopika Risam from ACH has volunteered as a liaison; AC notes that EADH didn't have opportunity to solicit nominations. OE notes importance of sending message of transparency and democracy.
- Proposal: to indeed to have a SIG liaison attending SC meetings and on SC listserv, and to ask HS to present the two current potential nominees to the SIG conveners, and to return to the SC with a name (or names) to become SIG liaison.

Appointment of Committee Chairs:

- **Infrastructure committee** (nominee: Christof Schöch). Christof is confirmed.
- JN notes difficulty of managing such "back-office" nominations and appointments, since we really need esp. trustworthy and well-informed candidates; NF notes that we will be dealing with this in governance reforms.
- **Publications committee** (discussing extension for Kathleen Fitzpatrick). CM notes that

Leif Isaksen has already expressed interest in serving on, and potentially standing for Chair. JF proposes offering the new candidate for chair, and asking Kathleen to continue on the committee as a transition. JN would like to keep her involved especially to shepherd her current project through approval. Leif confirmed as new Chair of Publications Cmte. Table to Monday question of Kathleen's continuing on cmte for at least a year, pending JF discussing this with Kathleen.

- **Communications committee** (already confirmed: Hannah Jacobs)

4. Admissions Committee report and discussion (incl. SIG discussion) (2:30-3:00 Harold)

Admissions Committee Report

- South African association and RedHD have both expressed interest and readiness for possibly becoming COs; PA has forwarded email related to formation of Korean DH ass'n, now in discussion with aaDH and ADHO re: potential relationship.
- Calls out particular work done by GO::DH.
- Notes previous approval of AVinDH SIG (via email list)
- Notes important and strategic work that the GO::DH SIG has operated; HS proposes doing something (unspecified) to promote the continuing work of this SIG. OE notes that funding for GO::DH webmaster would be most welcomed. Hesitation to make this an automatic entitlement, but the SC would welcome, e.g., a proposal for special funding.

ADHO-Humanistica discussion paper:

- HS summarizes: NB that in the early stages of its development, Humanistica was not uniformly in favor of affiliating with ADHO, but in the end that affiliation was unanimously approved. Useful for ADHO to think of Humanistica as an instance of a class of organizations that may be idiosyncratic; ADHO needs to think about how to accommodate these. HS advises thoughtfulness in our response; think about what our decision says about what we believe about digital humanities. Need to be cautious about telling organizations how they should organize themselves. HS notes that we had flagged the potential value of a proposal coming from outside our current norms; this proposal responds to that.
- NF: has any financial modeling been done exploring the impact of this inclusion on the overall ADHO financial picture. HS says that he has: considering the idea of sharing institutional income equally, but sharing individual membership income based on geography, on various models.
- JN: is it time for us to think about creative ways to deal with variations in types of COs? Explored with Humanistica other forms of affiliation?
- HS: this would be difficult; until we have pinned down the new governance structure, it's difficult to speculate about what this would look like
- JN: could this work as a kind of incentive for the Associate Organizations we have already, to say that they'd like a different organizational status? Will there be suddenly four more groups wanting the same treatment? CM notes that his biggest concern as former head of DHd is it would turn into a large organization that would really rock the ADHO boat. The AO mechanism was able to feed these numbers and energy into EADH, as an attempt to keep things under the existing structure. CM understands that other groups see things differently. Asks what a DH organization must do, what must its mission be, to see it as part of ADHO - aside from mere financial concerns? This could

mirror our "top-slice" approach to fund centralized services. As far as EADH goes, it would have been detrimental if DHd had wanted to come in as a CO, and many.

SIG Joint Meeting Notes (submitted by Kathy Weimar, co-convener of GeoHumanities SIG)

- HS invites attendance at the SIG Joint meeting, so that the SIGs can know of the very positive support that the SIGs have by the SC.

Libraries & DH SIG proposal:

- Majority of voting members already expressed approval by email.Motion to accept this proposal (KW), unanimously approved.

5. Conference bids (3:00-6:00)

DH2017 (90 minutes)

- Montreal (presented by Stéfan Sinclair)
- Pittsburgh (presented by Scott Weingart)
- Discussion & decision

Presentations and discussions off the record.

Decision: Montreal

DH2018 (90 minutes)

- Mexico City (presented by Ernesto Priani and Alberto Martinez)
- Tokyo (presented by Charles Muller and Toru Tomabechi)
- Discussion & decision

Presentations and discussions off the record.

Decision: Mexico City

Points from general discussion of conference bids:

- This year: All bidders were in the room for all presentations. It was unclear during SC discussion whether this follows past practice, but general consensus that this was salutary (and the practice was later, in fact, found to be required by the ADHO "Guidelines for Prospective Local Organizers of Digital Humanities Conferences")
- SB and AC both reiterate importance of making the call for conference hosting proposals more explicit in what we're looking for: multiculturalism, childcare, etc.
- "We can only accept one bid. Every failed bid has its particular form of tragedy." -JF

6:00 Adjourn

7:00 ADHO All-Boards Dinner

_____

_____

Monday, June 29, 4:00-6:00

EA building (room EA.2.09), UWS Parramatta South campus

4:00-5:30 Review and discuss plan for implementation of changes to ADHO membership, governance and financing (Neil F.)

- See Minutes of the 2014 Lausanne meeting for previous related discussion (in the Tuesday, July 8, session, 11:00-noon -- near the bottom of the page).
- Review edits to Governance Protocol reflecting changes already approved. (Cf. current Governance Protocol here.)

Neil introduces the renewed strategy discussion

- Goal of bringing it to completion within a year
- Summary of things that have already been affirmed, from Neil's summary document

JN notes desire to declare victory early on those things we've already accomplished; primarily membership issues.

NF recalls outstanding membership reforms:

- One rep per CO on Board (newly reconfigured from SC). -- Decision: relegate to Governance reforms, remove from Membership
- No more "structural representation" of COs on ADHO committees.-- (already consensus on this). Decision: relegate to Governance reforms, remove from Membership
- Mechanisms to allow individuals to express interest in being involved in ADHO activities, via the membership form: already supported by consensus, but awaiting implementation of new membership system.
- Are we changing model of membership so as to accept non-geographic member orgs, and if so, how do we reconfigure current regional distribution of funds?   NF notes that this geographic requirement is indeed embodied in the Admissions Protocol (para. 2.b: "It can be seen as representing a digital humanities community that has a definable geographical scope at country level or larger") -- but they don't define what constitutes a CO with specificity. Decision: relegate to Governance reforms, remove from Membership
- Finally, need to define minimal requirements or norms for what should be a CO, what an AO, and what a SIG.

Discussion:

- SS: should consider as part of this conversation the question of what causes COs to disassemble; this gets added to the "parking lot" of issues to be considered in relation to Governance
- JN: issue of continued growth in the number of COs, and the resulting unwieldiness of the SC

General consensus that currently, it's clear that admission as a CO requires *unanimous* consent of the current COs.

CC notes need to revisit Governance Protocol (which still has only 2 COs in its subtitle).

General discussion about need to keep Protocols up to date (or to keep current versions).

NF: presentation of state of funding reforms:

- Treasurer's group has been tasked with developing a statement on financial transparency which get shared with Neil and John, then with SC. CM asks whether we all get to see it yet? JN: not until Treasurer and Chair consult on it.
- Treasurer's group was tasked with developing a model of shared, collaborative banking infrastructure for COs. After study, this was found to be impractical, so was reformulated as "best practices" for efficient transfer of funds, a topic still being discussed
- Treasurer's Group was asked to model finances of taking over OUP membership management functions. Modeling has been done, but implementation planning still in process. JM, CM, and Paul Spence will meet to review these models before passing along to JN.
- Financial modeling for ADHO assumption of conference finances. Done, and passed along
- New financial modeling task: How non-regional COs would affect current funding distribution structure for COs.
- CM requests a second financial model, turning current model on its head: Use current revenue generated by institutional subscriptions to pay for everything ADHO delivers and does on behalf of COs; and treat individual membership income as going directly to COs (NB that this would solve the problem of non-regional COs).
  - Discussion: JM concurs that this is one avenue that hasn't been explored, but should be. HS recalls that the Treasurer's group already proposed that in London. HS's models didn't envision sharing of complete institutional income, but they did reveal that new COs, if they depend wholly on individual income, may require minimal levels of support for a few years.
  - AC asks about balance between institutional and individual membership. OE predicts that institutional income will eventually go down; some dissent about whether we can really predict this.
  - JN notes that we've already considered other income sources (sponsorships, conference income, etc.), which he has already begun discussing with J.Unsworth and others. JN proposes keeping this part of discussion separate. CM asks: what are the tasks that we want ADHO to perform, and how much do they cost?
  - HS: during discussions before and during London strategy meetings, focus was on what ADHO could divest and give back to COs; there may be thing that made sense to centralize with a smaller number of COs but don't make sense with larger number of COs.
  - SB echoes: balance between the "lean" ADHO and an ADHO that really provides a lot of needed services; she says she is torn. Maybe shift towards pegging CO income towards membership is the right direction, maybe word the policy around the COs taking a proportion of membership money, perhaps the initial proportion is 100%, but each year we could vote on the proportion to support a flexible policy to retain adaptability and enable us to fund ADHO-level initiatives if agreed that they are needed.
  - JN observes that for instance we may need to hire an office manager, especially if

we're managing the conference. JM: question to raise about how we can determine which categories of expenditures ought to be shifted to COs; this was a question in London that still hasn't been addressed. (COs handling their own publications? their own awards?).

- NF: perhaps there are two different models that are blurring each other. "Lightweight" could mean that little funding goes to ADHO; but could also mean lack of intrusiveness, more autonomy. Infrastructural services cost a lot but they are enabling, not intrusive. Maybe what we really mean by lightweight is that ADHO is there to facilitate the COs; if we can find economies of scale, then that's good; but when we dictate to the COs, that's out of bounds. CM agrees, esp. with "facilitator" characterization of ADHO.
- CM rephrases discussion: we need to find a nice way to live with the paradox of centralization/decentralization; we want to centralize where there are economies of scale: infrastructure, strategic investment. Other areas don't make sense, either politically or impractical to implement. NB that the treasurers gave up on a shared banking infrastructure; his current research into the membership administration suggests a similar problem. Maybe better to buy one product that everyone can use, but not seek a fully integrated solution that will serve all of the COs through a single interface.
- JN: COs also retain autonomy with respect to publications. SS: we need to keep ourselves in check; we're a governing body and hence tend to look for things to govern. NF observes that all of the SC members are here as representatives of the COs.

- Remaining modeling task: Model the cost of hiring an executive director. JN notes that now we simply couldn't afford to do it. KDO that we may not even be allowed to hire someone as a non-profit; JM clarifies that we could contract. NF asks JM to add this possibility to his suite of financial models. JN asks whether this is not the same role as a deputy treasurer? NF reminds that we have an unsustainable model of huge load on the SC chair: perpetual legislation, that will increase as we grow larger. If we don't change something, we're headed for a train wreck.

NF: Governance reforms

- Satellite / nucleus organizational model has already been approved -- but we haven't defined precisely what a CO might be (as against an Associate Organization) and we need to come up with minimal language about this
- Recommendation to establish a Board of Directors + Business Executive model (incl. 4 ADHO Core Offices) has not been approved or even discussed much. NF notes that this is a very big question, that requires a lot of thought. NF: we need to come back to the SC with a lean set of rationales and recommendations. Proposes another meeting of a small group of people to flesh out this process again. Would find it impossible to do this over email; believes it really demands face-to-face. Proposes perhaps using the opportunity of an upcoming London meeting with OUP.

Discussion:

- JN proposes moving slowly: e.g., don't dissolve all the committees at once.
- CM proposes 3-phase approach:
  1. a general solution to be proposed to group

2. an implementation plan
3. the actual implementation

- AC asks: How long will this all take? Are we not focused too much on ourselves as a bureaucratic organization? Also time and effort already spent on these reforms: the SC has evolved substantially since the first discussions, but will it go to waste? AC notes the problem that our collective mind is changing, and will want to revisit what has already been decided
- JF notes that AC's point is well taken: this has taken long enough that the collective mind has changed significantly since it was first thought through. Instead, we should take an "agile approach": what is the first thing we can take on, that can actually be accomplished? Make the problem a set of smaller tasks, rather than taking on the entire problem at once.
- JF and SS concur that our original instinct - not to put bandaids on things, but rather to restructure entirely - was perhaps a good one -- but it did not foresee that the process would take 3-5 years.
- HS agrees that original impulse was that the original ADHO idea had worked for 10 years, but was showing its strain. It seemed to us that it *didn't* make sense to attack this piecemeal -- but it's possible that was incorrect, given the scope of the changes. How can we deal with immediate issues, but not forget the bigger picture?
- NF notes that we have indeed been doing this all along: taking low-hanging fruit.
- JF: if the question is, what is the next pressure point, then the Humanistica question is probably the very one: the question of how funding and representation will affect ADHO.
- JN: encourages NF to come up with more manageable set of reforms.
- CM: we still need to maintain larger vision; recommends that we follow Neil's recommendation that a small group come up with an implementation plan. NF echoes: identify long-term strategic goals and be guided by them. HS: initial step should include recommendations about some specific things that can be implemented.
- CM takes issue with metaphor of "pressure point" - wants us to find the right balance between strategic and long- and short-term visions. There are certain things that our institutional memory tells us have served well. Proposes again the 3-phase approach, guided by a vision, requiring specific steps and prioritization.
- NF would like to identify urgent things that need to be resolved, whether or not we call them pressure points.
- SS does want to enumerate things that don't serve us well, e.g., discussion and voting over email; burden on SC chair; others.
- HS agrees that another first step is needed.
- JN identifies growth pattern of COs, decision making process in COs, as other urgent matters.
- NF believes that we hear the priorities of the group: still wants a smaller group to meet face-to-face to start working through it, consisting of those who are in London: HS, AC, JN, JM, KDO, NF?
- SB thinks that piggybacking on London meeting is a good idea, but a combination of face-to-face and small-group online collaboration would be better.
- JN believes we need a larger vision first.
- SB fears that we may be in danger of reinventing and restarting the exact same process that started as was done in London meetings.
- NF notes that this is not a different process -- but rather unfolding the governance

recommendations that were begun, and that the small group be tasked with staying true to the original vision, not coming up with a new one. Notes that these were only proposals, not mandates; wants most to finish what we started, not start something new.

- JN notes urgency of making a decision on how to move forward.
- PA notes that it's clear we can't move forward in the current large group, thus supports the smaller group approach. We need to be careful with the language in which we express the process, acknowledging what was already done, what has changed as time has passed, etc.
- CM reminds that we're now in convergence phase for the previously-started process: focusing on the key issues that really are the hard nuts to crack. Having dealt with low-hanging fruit, we're left with the harder issues that we really have to tackle and to implement (assessing risk, staging implementation, etc.). Doesn't believe in design by committee; advocates for a small group of trusted people to come up with good solutions; admiration for NF for taking up the large task.
- AC would like to mandate that the small group's composition be the first thing decided.
- SB: we are not totally at odds (whether or not to restart the process); agrees that we need to do something to move forward with. Thinks there are some clearly existing gaps that need to be identified, in order to be clear where the decisions are coming from. Wary of putting too much pressure on the small group (and on NF); wants to entrust NF with recommendation on how he things we should move forward.

Next steps:

- A process of finally getting to the last and most difficult part of the London recommendation, which have not been discussed or voted on by the SC, by sifting through those recommendations and coming to terms with them in relation to budgetary realities; come up with a way through that can be implemented, and that is true to the original vision of the London documents: all of this so that the SC has something to really approve and act on.
- Next steps: Arianna, John, Jarom?, Chris, Neil and Harold if possible, meet in London to move this forward; finding their own funds; ADHO funding will be given for Neil to attend. Prepare with position papers and groundwork. Ideally, include someone from one of the other COs (not EADH or ACH).
- Ideally, new membership model should accommodate Centernet as well.

5:30 Resumption of unfinished topics from Sunday*

Resume Humanistica discussion (with CC's comments)

- HS: Admissions Cmte is very much in favor of including Humanistica (and organizations like it) in ADHO; the position is not meant to end the discussion, but rather to start it.
- CC: Notes that there's a lot of work to be done: e.g., changing the geographic clause in the Admissions Protocol. Reaffirms Humanistica's strong desire to become a CO. Agrees that everybody will have the same questions. Humanistica does indeed have members that may not be (and have never been) members of another CO. One of the most interesting developments is a colleague from Tunisia; it's the idea to involve more non-European francophone people in Humanistica, possibly as the first move toward including something like GO::DH. Requests some sort of positive or message from the SC for Humanistica.

- JN asks for explicit reasons for why Humanistica would not find other two options (AO and SIG) as viable alternatives.
- CC: Humanistica simply does not see itself as equivalent of any existing SIG. There is no SIG representation on the SC; Humanistica wants this.
- SS: Acknowledges bias in this discussion, but notes that Humanistica will strengthen DH in Canada: years of efforts to get francophone DHers in Canada to join CSDH have been less than fully effective; this is not aspirational, but already has demonstrated effect. Also NB: Humanistica is not non-regional, but rather multi-regional.
- JF notes that some of these regions are already covered by existing regional CO organizations. Believes that current geographical distribution is obviously destined to become problematic at some point; Humanistica is simply a natural way to identify a new constituency and bring it in.
- CM notes that there is already another multi-regional association at the table (DHd); but there is an element of risk in this, that is, that the AO model was designed to prevent fragmentation, and that the Humanistica desire may inspire similar desires to become COs. Would support the Humanistica addition, on condition that it be the occasion to reconsider the income distribution. NB that EADH is currently the largest overall membership base, and yet is facing a cash flow crisis. If that problem could be solved, then EADH's concern about retaining its existing membership profile would be removed. So a practical way forward is not to design a next Humanistica, but rather produce a structural solution to the larger problem.
- CM believes that we need to signal something back to Humanistica to express our respect and our interest, and then a declaration of intent (since we can't go further with Humanistica until we resolve some other basic issues around Governance); notes also that we don't want to create false expectations among other emerging bodies.
- HS: All of what CM said is included in the Admissions paper. As non-voting member, strongly favors.
- Motion and action item on Admissions Cmte: Compose and send a formal declaration of intent to incorporate Humanistica as an ADHO CO at some point. Carried unanimously.

Review of financial impact of decisions made, and adjustments as needed

JM refers all to his email of 6/29, and to revised spreadsheet attached thereto.

New figures requiring ca. 10% increase in ADHO allocation, based on three new expenditures detailed in that email:

1. webmaster
2. conference publications infrastructure support (DH Abstracts project)
3. extra pages for 5th issue of DSH

This results in ca. 10% reduction in all CO allocations.

Proposes funding NF's trip to London out of the contingency fund, for which such an expense is already foreseen and approved (and won't affect distribution to COs).

Motion to fund Neil's travel to London for such a meeting, and others find their own funding. Passed unanimously.

Action item: SS volunteers to create a short current snapshot of the benefits of the ADHO

affiliation, for circulation to the COs and possibly beyond.

Round robin request for final matters: none.

6:00 Adjourn

_____

_____