

# Draft Minutes: ADHO Steering Committee Meeting, 2016 (Kraków)

## List of Decisions and Motions passed (noted in red in the text)

- Motion: to continue Ian Rifkin contract: carried unanimously.
- Motion: ask Infrastructure Cmte to hire a consultant on membership management, amount to be determined. Carried unanimously.
- Motion: to migrate Confluence to MediaWiki after consultation with stakeholders. Carried unanimously.
- Motion to accept the newly established flipped ADHO financial model, with slightly changed nomenclature, and with the addition of “floor.” Passed unanimously.
- Approval of Diane Jakacki’s proposal to extend the pool of reviewers.
- Humanistica accepted as a Constituent Organization of ADHO.
- Utrecht to host DH2019
- Motion to financially support a 5th (conference) open access issue of DSH. Unanimously accepted.
- Approval of the Governance framework as written be adopted, and determination of an implementation committee and plan (which would next take up the Associations document). Unanimously supported.

- Karina van Dalen-Oskam unanimously approved for a full two-year term as SC Chair.
- Elena Gonzalez-Blanco to be appointed Secretary of the Foundation; Karina van Dalen-Oskam to be designated President of the Foundation.
- Motion that the SC commit to sponsoring and holding a workshop (or forum) on diversity at the next DH conference (in Montreal), details to be determined. Passed unanimously.
- The SC formally thanks John Nerbonne for his great contributions to ADHO during his service as ADHO SC Chair. Passed unanimously by voting members, and joined unanimously by the non-voting members present.

**Action items (noted in green in the text)**

- KvDO to do: designate a person (e.g., CS/Infrastructure, combination of LOs) to follow up with “DH abstracts” project team to evaluate phase 1+2, to get payment for that work, and to determine whether funding for a 3rd phase is needed.
- Action item for Secretariat: When implementation of governance reforms begins, we should ensure reflection on how our internal organization appears to the outside world.
- KvDO to do: identify new Awards Cmte Chair

- KvDO to designate an implementation committee and plan for the newly approved Governance framework
- GW will check the procedure (in the SIG protocol) for disbanding/ sunsetting of SIGs due to inactivity.
- Action: inform OUP of the decision not to increase membership-only fee (in spite of anticipated increase in DSH subscription price).

*Sunday, July 10th, 9:30-17:30*

***Location: Collegium Paderevianum, Bldg A, Room 2***

**In attendance:**

- Barbara Bordalejo (BB)
- Susan Brown (SB)
- Fabio Ciotti (FC; non voting Membership officer)
- Arianna Ciula (AC)
- Tanya Clement (TC)
- Claire Clivaz (non voting, CCC Chair)
- Karina van Dalen-Oskam (KvDO)

- Oyvind Eide (OE)
- Neil Fraistat (NF)
- Elena Gonzalez-Blanco (EG)
- Leif Isaksen (LI)
- Hannah Jacobs (Communications Chair) (HJ)
- Maurizio Lana (ML)
- Jarom McDonald (via Skype) (JM)
- Chris Meister (CM)
- Christof Schöch (non-voting, ISC chair; CS)
- Ray Siemens (RS)
- Stéfan Sinclair (SS)
- Tomoji Tabata (TT)
- Daniel O'Donnell (non-voting outgoing GO::DH chair/DSCN Editor DO)
- Kay Walter (KWa)
- Kathy Weimer (KWe)
- Glen Worthey (GW)

***Voting representatives of Constituent Organizations:***

- aaDH, 1 vote: Sarah Kenderdine (Glen Worthey, proxy)
- ACH, 2 votes: Stéfan Sinclair, Tanya Clement
- centerNet, 1 vote: Kay Walter
- CSDH/SCHN, 1 vote: Susan Brown
- EADH, 3 votes: Arianna Ciula, Chris Meister, Barbara Bordalejo
- JADH, 1 vote: Tomoji Tabata

***ADHO Foundation Board: concomitant with the meeting of the ADHO SC***

- OFFICERS: Glen Worthey (President), Karina van Dalen-Oskam (Secretary), Jarom McDonald (Treasurer)

**9.30 Welcome (Karina, 10 minutes)**

- Welcome by ADHO Chair (Karina)
- Attendance / Introduction

Apologies: Paul Arthur is stuck at the airport and asks that Glen Worthey vote

on behalf of aaDH in his absence. Everybody accepts.

#### **9.40 Chair's report (Karina) (5 minutes)**

-SC report posted in meeting documents available on the wiki. Karina asks if there are any comments or suggestions on this document.

-AC asks for the process of how the CO representatives to all committees are communicated to the ADHO Steering Cmte. Secretariat will gather these names via email; no need to do this during the meeting.

#### **Committee reports (taken up early to accommodate delayed Treasurer communication)**

*Please see written reports on the [Meeting Documents](#) page.*

- **Conference Coordinating Committee (presented by CC)**

No comments on Report, and no additions.

- **Multilingualism/Multiculturalism Committee (presented by ML)**

Multilingual ADHO website. Translation will involve not only technical aspects (different levels of authorizations, coordination of different people to work

together), but also multicultural. MLMC want the website to be able to face different cultures appropriately. Language-based associations will be asked to translate the website culturally, and not only linguistically.

MLMC would like to participate more in the conference as a committee, e.g., to encourage multilingual contributions. There has been strong discussion at the PC committee about this issue.

MLMC has been involved in recent modifications of the CCC conference protocol; MLMC Chair will be an ex-officio member of the CCC committee.

DO asks about interaction of MLMC with GO::DH.

ML notes great collaboration with Alex Gil as co-chair of MLMC and member of GO::DH exec. One issue: MLMC is represented on SC, but GO::DH is not. Alex and ML make all MLMC decisions jointly, even if ML is the one who presents issues to SC. Proposes having GO::DH more formally represented on SC.

DO notes that he is now stepping down as chair of GO::DH (Elika Ortega will be taking over). Proposes formally co-opting a member of GO::DH as a member of MLMC.

ML notes that co-opted members can't vote, so would like perhaps a more formal representation.

CM notes that this might create a special type of SIG; can't just upgrade GO:DH (or other SIGs) to a formal body in the governance structure. Suggests that co-option is more flexible, less anomalous.

**10:30 Treasurer's report + ADHO Budget 2016 and 2017 (Jarom McDonald via Skype, 30 minutes; taken out of agenda order due to communications issues)**

Presentation of Financial Report.

OUP accounting information received only 3 days ago, says JM, so JM's number are somewhat preliminary.

If expenses come up during SC meeting, JM will be able to revise budget numbers accordingly.

OUP income slightly (ca. 10%) down from last year, but if we include membership-only fees from Associate Organizations, which are unaccounted for by OUP, the total income is actually up 7.5%. So although there is a slight decrease in print subscriptions, the total income does reflect previous financial models predicting an increase in membership numbers and income.

Subscription numbers:

Institutional and Consortia-based: 2,599

Joint subscriptions 233

Individual society subscriptions 90

"Rest of world" regions (those not represented by a CO) continue to grow in subscription numbers.

JM asks whether there might be a simple explanation for the decline in centerNet memberships/income; KWa clarifies that there is indeed a slight decrease, but more surprising is the number of institutions that opt for the low-price (\$84) memberships -- so income is much lower than actual centerNet memberships. Notes that many institutions already had multiple subscriptions to DSH, and therefore opted for a lower-rate membership category. JM clarifies the different income/membership models for centerNet; asks CM to keep that in mind while discussing governance and finances. CM and KWa have discussed some of these issues; KWa notes difficulty in keeping in touch with actual heads of centers.



Expense Accounting: We underspent in infrastructure and overspent in publications. Actual expenditures lower than planned. JM proposes including the one extra DSH issue per year as a regular feature of the budget in future.

Major ongoing issue: we bank in Euros, but are paid in GBP. Because of recent steep decline in GBP exchange rate, ADHO lost about 20% of its spendable income.

JM budget proposals:

Keep expenditures the same.

Reduce sysadmin backup budget line and decrease backstops (neither of which have been needed for years).

There are currently 25,000 Euros in reserve; this is almost half a year's budget.

Proposes not contributing to this reserve this year.

JM proposes to reduce minimum threshold paid to each CO from 4.000€ to 3000€. This will most negatively affect aaDH and centerNet, cutting ca. 500 € from each of their disbursements, but will be a benefit to the others COs

Proposal of suspension 5000 € to COs. CM proposes infrastructure committee: need to invest to implement a new membership management system and use the 5000€ for that. This issue is becoming more and more urgent and important. He does not see any chance to have positive organizational structural changes without that.

Euro/pound conversion is concerning. Brexit is mostly to blame. This is money lost that has been collected in the past. We have been strongly punished. However, CM says it is risky to overreact now too.

JM notes that CO disbursements happen in September, but bursaries are distributed immediately: it's a real-world example of how the exchange rate decline affects real people.

SS questions/comments:

Improvements to Humanist listserv: should this be an ACH expense, or a

general ADHO expense? E.g., Humanist doesn't even handle diacritics! Notes that this expense often falls through the cracks.

Time and mechanism for transfer of OUP's reserve. SS asks how transfers are made from OUP. JM responds: Money comes in to EADH from OUP, is transferred to Jarom upon request (e.g., first half-year already paid by OUP). No need to take any money from OUP at least until September.

LI notes that Brexit fallout is still to be determined; advises caution, given the many uncertainties.

LI question about large numbers of DSH subscriptions in other parts of world: does this represent increased interest in DH in these countries? FC notes that these are institutional subscriptions, so probably not directly representative of increased interest.

NF asks Chris and Jarom if 5000€ is actually enough to create a new membership management system? CM: By no means, not nearly enough!

### Confirming (by stipulation) voting membership of ADHO SC 2016-2017

- aaDH: - 1 vote
- ACH: - 2 vote
- EADH: - 3 vote
- centerNet: - 1 vote
- CSDH/SCHN - 1 vote
- JADH - 1 vote

JM notes that, as usual, these numbers are rounded, so, for example, ACH's proportional votes are closer to 2.3, and EADH's 2.7. GW asks about how Humanistica will be reflected in the ADHO steering committee representation.

JM: It is necessary first to decide about the total number of voting members (whether 9 or 11); also notes that new governance proposals might change this proportional representation model altogether.

## **11:00 Committee reports & discussion continue**

*Please see written reports on the [Meeting Documents](#) page.*

- **Infrastructure Committee (presented by CS)**

Infrastructure Cmte didn't spend the whole budget. CS notes that Ian Rifkin does a great job as sys admin. See written report for details of the many smaller and bigger things Ian and the ISC did over the past year.

New proposals:

1. Continue current system with Ian (monthly payment of \$720, plus allowance for overtime). But not to continue budgeting an extra backup: not only have we never used it, if there were a need to hire someone in an emergency, it would be very difficult to do.
2. Try to move forward with a membership system, in two steps: a) Assist COs in constructing direct links to signup for a specific CO/AO on OUP page. This is a transitional measure to create more of a link between COs and their membership. b) Budget money to scope an actual customized solution. Makes sense to hire a professional to this, as first step in a long-term investment in a new system.
3. CS: Confluence wiki: old version and a limited number of accounts.

Questions about updating the updating the Confluence wiki or migrating to MediaWiki. Would it make sense to move to Mediawiki? Open, free, unlimited accounts. Installing it is not a problem, the problem would be content migration. CS will investigate with current wiki users.

Discussion of proposal #2:

Fabio doubts possibility of changing OUP interface: it is indeed possible, but it's unclear what side effects would be of direct links; depends on OUP not making any changes.

AC question: is there a way in which the income OUP generates via our membership could be re-invested in some way? Could they work towards the improvement of the system and structures? CS says that it makes more sense to separate member administration from subscriptions.

CM notes that technical details of OUP reporting do take care of individual CO numbers.

Report on meeting at OUP: KvDO, Edward Vanhoutte (DSH editor), CM, revealed that we are only a tiny portion of OUP's budget, so OUP are not inclined to do major changes for us.

CM says it is a good idea to remain with OUP until there is a robust system of our own in place.

DO notes that the problems of journal subscription and membership management are totally different, and should be separated.

SB concurs with need to do something about this -- but will we have to wait for another year? Can we be more proactive about this? Urgent need if we're going to do anything about governance reforms, etc. CS responds that it would be irresponsible to make a budget proposal for the system itself, without a consultation.

KvDO notes general agreement.

Discussion of proposal #3:

CM suggests to restrict content migration to the last year and archive the rest. CS suggest to keep Confluence wiki statically available as a record for consultation.

GW asks about the estimation of pages at the confluence wiki. (SS finds out: 182 pages in the current wiki.) Notes that the Confluence wiki is used by multiple organizations (ACH, DHQ Editorial, and others), so we should consult with them.

DO suggests to continue with both systems together for one year.

**Motion: to continue Ian Rifkin contract: carried unanimously.**

**Motion: ask Infrastructure Cmte to hire a consultant on membership management, amount to be determined. We will come back to the amount later. Carried unanimously.**

**Motion: to migrate Confluence to MediaWiki after consultation with stakeholders. Carried unanimously.**

CS thanks his fellow committee members and especially Ian. Notes that he is open to any requirements other committees may have from Infrastructure Cmte.

- **Membership Committee - FC**

In the past 35 days (leading up to the conference) membership numbers have increased. Notable especially in Italy and Nordic countries

Notes that there will always be errors in numbers until we have a new member management system.

EADH has had a great increase in members, especially thanks to German Association. Great success of the DHN (Digital Humanities in the Nordic countries) association <http://dig-hum-nord.eu>.

Italian association is stable.

There are currently 258 joint members of the ADHO COs. This number must

always be added manually to the general membership numbers of each CO in order to obtain final membership numbers. See FC's thought experiment in the report: comparing the numbers when joint memberships are added on geographic basis, or when joint memberships are eliminated altogether. Number of members that pay for journal subscription is decreasing. Trend has been going on for the last several years and will likely continue. FC asks for suggestions to address this trend.

FC asks for management system and subscription for journal to be separated, outside of OUP. Believes it is necessary to find a solution. Current system is very hard to understand from the interface point of view.

KvDO asks for questions.

OE asks for clarification on "skews" of geography-based members; ML notes that these are indeed guesses, and very speculative.

BB suggests that we could simply ask people their geographic provenance when registering.

## **11.15 Break**

### **11.30 Conference reports (30 minutes) + Manfred Thaller (PC Chair 2016 invited to give his report) + LOs Jan Rybicki and Maciej Eder**

- **DH2016 PC Report (Manfred) (10 minutes)**

Manfred: There was a 60% acceptance rate for DH2016: the reality is that, in spite of Big Tent idea, many of the rejected papers were rejected somewhat "by chance," that is, on the basis of individual definitions of DH applied by reviewers. Suggests thematic threads for future. The current program was constructed along lines of "primarily textual, infrastructural, etc."

One of the problems of the PC's work calendar comes when it first meets at or after previous conference: after that first meeting there's so little time before CfP goes, there's no time for serious discussions. Happy that PC2018 already

nominated; Manfred encourages discussion of conference structure.

Corollary problem: the book of abstracts. Manfred notes that Maciej has put in a tremendous amount of effort into something that basically has no academic merit. The very least that should be done to acknowledge this effort would be to call it something else. Might be worthwhile into investing more into, and making the book of abstracts something more generally usable in academic CVs.

Manfred notes that 20-30 submissions by newcomers turned down simply because the work described was not yet ready for presentation. Suggests a separate “forum for newcomers”, a separate paper competition, etc., with no promise that these preliminary submissions would count as publications.

Regarding the question of how DH is defined, and how well the conference covers the field: it would be useful to compare the accepted conference submissions with the recent “Defining DH” volume.

Role of the pre-conference events, particularly SIGs, is too undefined. Pre-conference events are supposed to be events which need serious additional preparation. The current structure of dates and submissions for pre-conference events (which often actually require more time for their own CfPs, etc.) are counterproductive. Proposes merging all deadlines.

This year, the SIGs were able to endorse pre-conference events. Manfred sees no point in this endorsement. Believes that a pre-conference event endorsed by a SIG should not have more privileges than any other. In practical terms, Manfred recommends that either the notion of SIG endorsement be dropped (because its distinction turned out to be minimal), or it should be solidified, e.g., each SIG could be entitled to one (and only one) pre-conference event, accepted without review.

We had an unusually large number of submissions by members of the PC itself, and Manfred notes that we should reconsider the reviewing of these submissions.

Proposal to withdraw papers if at least one presenter has not registered for the conference at least 4 weeks before conference.

KvDO says that most of Manfred's suggestions have to be taken up by the CCC. CC notes that conference procedures have extremely recently been revised, so hesitates to revise immediately. CC notes that the previous revision in 2011, that 5 years is too long -- but such a quick revision is also difficult. KvDO suggests keeping a list of proposals for the next major revision.

BB suggest including reviewers' names in the reviews. She wants to avoid situations of revenge or cruelty... Manfred recommends against public reviews, because rank should not have so many privileges. BB believes that reviewer anonymity generally only benefits well-established people, and often ends up being used against newcomers or outsiders (for example, when anonymous reviewers are able to harshly judge a submission based on the non-Anglophone name of the submitter).

CM disputes the evidence for this contention, and supports Manfred's opinion against open reviews. People have to review senior colleagues proposals and he does not want his name to be public if he were to write a negative review. Suggests that the right way to approach this is to have some kind of ethics for reviewers. Perhaps a revision made by the CCC... CM would propose to invest a bit into raising consciousness of this particular issue and see how it goes.

TC suggests the flagging of onerous or upsetting reviews: CM notes that the system already has this capability. ML notes that losing anonymity is a problem for younger reviewers. DO notes that this question arises frequently; suggests that we need a separate discussion (perhaps as a committee looking



at ethics and reviewing more broadly, including the referee choosing reviews) as a way forward. SB suggests that we should again consider a double-blind review system.

KWe notes that the instructions for SIG-endorsed pre-conference activities were overly complicated, and did not fulfill the original larger request of the SIGs, and as such does not see the value in endorsement in its current practice; the SIG convenors are generally in line with Manfred's opinion that it is additional work without any actual benefit.

- **DH2016 LO Report (Jan Rybicki, Maciej Eder, 10 minutes)**

As of this meeting, Jan and Maciej report 876 registered participants! And they know of more people planning to come as last-minute registrants.

The conference budget is more than balanced with almost no external funding: the high registration numbers are a real godsend. DH2016 is financially in the black.

Number of participants + price of the conference were set according to the conference protocol. This is excellent for LO but bad for Local Participants from a country like Poland, where academic salaries are about 30% of those in other European countries, and registrations costs are prohibitive. That is a problem, and it gets worse moving both east and south. There are no transparent ways to allow some people to pay less; Jan believes there would have been even more attendees if there had been a lower rate.

Need to consider if we maintain the current system or not. Need to ask Mexican LOs whether they anticipate this will be an issue for DH2018. On the one hand, the present situation makes it easier for LOs to plan and finance the conference, but on the other hand it is necessary to reflect on the effects of local differences.

A minor point: we should be more wary of local academic / cultural specificities and idiosyncrasies; would be best if PC consults with Local Organizers, who sometimes have some explaining to do at their universities about how the PC makes its decisions.

Maciej: Community building in Poland received a major impetus from hosting the conference here: many institutions new to DH are represented. Many great new DH initiatives arose as an effect of the conference, both in Kraków and Warsaw. Stresses that ADHO might want to find ways to support local communities toward sustaining the long-term effects of the conference.

Maciej on the book of abstracts: quite a lot of technical work, transformation of submitted papers for style, bibliographic, and other forms of consistency. E.g., lots of submissions came in difficult-to-use formats. CM notes that human problems often override the technical ones; did the use of the DH Convalidator make things easier, or save any work?

Maciej: The whole process took lots of time, and the Convalidator helped, but of course didn't solve all problems. They had many people writing in because they were having problems with Convalidator. Would be very helpful if Convalidator included documentation, e.g., how to use MS Word styles to output Convalidator-friendly formats.

CM asks: how to make the book of abstracts something of greater academic value. Is the Publications Cmte working on this? LI: no, but for very specific reasons to be discussed later. However, Publications is working on Convalidator documentation.

CM: important to turn the book of abstracts into a particular valuable academic record. If it is not this, then it is not worth it to invest such a tremendous amount of work in it.

- **DH2017 LO Report (Stéfan), signing of the MOU (10 minutes)**

SS: No fancy cookies next year! Website has been quietly launched at [dh17.org](http://dh17.org) (redirecting to canonical ADHO URL). Rooms successfully booked.

8 rooms for parallel sessions, with the ability to book more rooms. The Amphitheater with 620 seats; anticipates this may be a pressure point for plenary sessions.

Residences and hotels are generally \$50-\$70 per night, with options up to \$100+ for hotels; Airbnb and other locations are being considered.

Next steps: wanting to work closer with PC and CCC to experiment with a virtual stream, to make the virtual conference a first-class citizen, and to say so in the CfP: a new line of access for people who can't attend. Looking at ConfTool payment integration (which hasn't been the case at recent conferences that have used their own payment systems).

Some social events, family, accommodations, activities, camps are lined up... but the LOs are going to continue working on that too.

Still looking at registration costs. \$200 for early birds (and a steep increase for later registration) and \$50 for students. Even at this low rate, the break-even point seems to be about 400 attendees.

MOU requires some modifications.

GW asks whether this is going to be the first ADHO funded conference. SS says that the 1000 € ADHO support for a hired conference officer will not be used due to the way LO arrangements have already been made.

KvDO: Jarom did not spend money coming to Krakow but he will use this money to go to Montreal.

CC notes that we're in a transition period, since LOs agreed to host under former MoU; starting in 2019, new hosts will be under the new MoU (anticipating ADHO funding of the conference).

SB asks about fee differential for virtual participation. SS notes that there are arguments both ways: doesn't want to incentivize the virtual stream too much, but there are fixed costs that virtual attendance foregoes.

DH2017 will have a strong multilingual element: the website is already fully bilingual. Program schedule will also be bilingual. Signage, etc., still planned to be bilingual. One very big-ticket item will be Translation for keynotes. Looking into synchronised translation.

LOs are still waiting for results of the Zampolli Prize before deciding on the number of keynotes; would like to have a francophone keynote (with simultaneous translation), but may still want to propose a smaller number of keynotes than usual, to keep costs down. SS notes that they will have to decide whether they go for a low-cost system or for a professional production of keynote streaming.

CC notes the open proposal from CCC to expand pool of reviewers; notes that Diane Jakacki did a great amount of work on this proposal. AC asks about the criteria, whether they will be retroactive for current reviewers. CC answers there are not new criteria, but that nobody knows or applies them. They want to highlight and apply reviewer criteria more consistently. Notes that the whole idea is to expand the pool, not to restrict it retroactively. ML suggests minimum of Master's Degree, perhaps a PhD. DO notes that requirement of having been a reviewer before already applies, so they only need to meet one other requirement -- finds this a very helpful approach. OE discuss the qualification degree required to be a reviewer: better not to require PhDs. KWe asks who will monitor compliance with these requirements. Notes that e.g., in the GeoHumanities, some reviewers have seemed less qualified in specific fields. Suggest a broad net for reviewers and not be restrictive. CC: The main point is to recruit good reviewers, to help the reviewers do good reviews, and to be responsive. Happy to see that Diane is taking this problem very seriously. RS notes that the problem of people not submitting reviews has been dealt with by

purging previous offenders -- but that these same people often return.

BB asks about Conference Navigator usability. KvDO asks to leave this topic for after lunch.

KvDO asks to vote to approve Diane's proposal to extend the pool of reviewers. Approved unanimously.

## **12.30 Lunch**

### **1:20 Committee Reports (cont.)**

- **Special Interest Groups Report (Kathy Weimer)**

KWe notes that her new role as SIG liaison has been key in facilitating communications with the SIG leaders.

Each SIG submitted a one-page report, and all contributed to a separate document with discussion points. SIG membership totals are close to 1000. Value of SIGs highlighted.

Previously, SIGs operated somewhat in a vacuum, but this situation has improved a lot in last 6 months, with KWe's role finally activated. Last year's (Sydney) meeting of SIG conveners was a very helpful move. Workshop endorsement had some low-level impact, but overall was probably not worth everyone's time. Hopes instead to have a designated slot in the program during which SIGs can schedule their events. Notes that, some years, thematically related workshops were scheduled simultaneously which breaks the potential audience into smaller numbers. Wants the SIGs to have a larger role in creation of conference program.

Asks for more tangible ADHO support to the SIGs to make the SIG business

possible.

LOD SIG will be disbanded. GW will check the procedure (in the SIG protocol) for disbanding/sunseting of SIGs due to inactivity.

CS notes one new SIG in formation (in progress): “Digital Literary Stylistics”.

KWe notes the need for a clearer procedure to formalize SIG creation, governance. NF notes that this hasn’t been formalized, but will be included in the ongoing governance discussions.

OE discusses whether this (“Digital Literary Stylistics”) should be a SIG at the ADHO level. DO does not see the downside to forming a SIG: what could possibly go wrong even in the worst case, if it’s an ill-advised SIG, etc.? LI reports on his experience with LOD. DO notes relative experience with groups who are too strict or too loose. Proposes that relying on the Admissions Cmte is too much infrastructure/formality for SIGs. DO asks only for coordination. KWe notes that there is lots of mystery among SIG conveners about how ADHO works in general; they need guidance, mentoring, etc. RS notes (representing Admissions Cmte) that they weren’t meant to be gatekeepers, but rather facilitators. DO notes that putting creation/approval of SIGs into the SIGs group could be the right amount of coordination and approval. KWe notes that the SIG ‘committee’ is an informal gathering of conveners, not really a committee and, thus, does not have a charge to facilitate SIG creation.

CM a bit uncomfortable for doing away altogether with gatekeeping function, e.g., what if a proposal represents a field that could evolve in a way in which we might lose control? Asks for responsibility, in a pragmatic way; he does not mind if the SIGs committee or the Admissions Committee takes care of that, but most important is the criterion followed and the responsibility which is involved in the process.

KWe notes that the SIG protocol makes a lot of good promises and proposals,

but how to enable them in reality?

SS: SIGs are probably the best way to recruit new reviewers.

NF notes that CCC probably has a role in conference-related SIG activities as well.

- **Communications Committee Report (Hannah Jacobs)**

HJ is in her 1st year as Communications Cmte chair. Communications fellows program is selecting its 3rd cohort of Communications fellows, who are primarily responsible for ADHO's social media presence, including a Storify of annual social media posts.

Highlights that the ADHO website hired in 2015 a webmaster.

Internationalization improved. Webmaster would like to step down now, but has agreed to remain in an advisory role. Now looking for someone to take over as webmaster.

Translation issues: She wants to propose to change the site from Drupal to WordPress, into a multi-site environment. Change is not easy but in the long term it will be easier to maintain. Need to establish translation workflows.

(CS notes that he would like to be on the Communications mailing list, since questions of platform and webmaster touch on Infrastructure concerns.)

DO notes that the Communications Fellows program appears to be a huge success from his point of view.

## **Admissions Committee Report (Ray, 15 minutes)**

Admissions Cmte has been talking with a number of regional organizations who may be interested in joining ADHO: Taiwanese, South African, Korean, and Chinese (not mentioned in the Admissions Cmte report). Some discussions with these organizations will take place during the conference -- only discussions at this point, will require many other discussions and consultation of protocols.

- Admission of Humanistica

Proposal to admit Humanistica. RS notes that Humanistica is a new type of CO. Reminds the SC that last year, the Admissions Cmte was instructed by the SC to send a letter of support in principle.

Since then, progress has been very positive towards Humanistica. **RS proposes to admit Humanistica as a CO, subject to outcome of Governance proposals. SS seconds it. Unanimously approved.** CC thanks the SC for this long-awaited decision.

KvDO asks the Admissions Cmte's advice on inviting non-participatory listeners from potential COs at ADHO committee meetings; RS notes that they do agree in principle that these should be invited, but notes that our numbers are now large enough that this may be problematic; will revisit with Harold at some point.

SS suggests that we revisit the monetary distributions to COs and to Humanistica, to look at the finances and study how this may impact the current distribution system.

CM asks RS to discuss the possibility of other ADHO affiliation mechanisms, e.g., an AO attached to an existing CO. How will we respond to the current aaDH situation (where the membership numbers are declining); expansion is always anticipated, but the danger of a decrease in numbers always exists.



Asks what would happen if CO membership dropped, for example, below 30.

CC asks for clarification in timing with respect to Humanistica's entrance as a CO: note the submitted document on Humanistica's admission and finances (mid-2018, but with possibility of ad-hoc financial assistance earlier, which has been customary). CC is asking about possibility of Humanistica participating now in discussions/decisions around the governance discussions. KvDO we'll check this with Harold Short (arriving in Kraków only Tuesday afternoon); Ray will try to be part of that conversation.

FC asks a member of Humanistica to be at the next ADHO SC meeting as a non-voting member, as many of the current participants in the meeting are now. KvDO asks to decide this on Tuesday.

### **DH Training Group (Ray)**

RS: ADHO training group created 2 years ago. Has been discussing whether or not this group should become a formal ADHO committee; RS will report on Group's desires on Tuesday.

### **1:45 Governance issues (Neil, 60 minutes)**

NF notes the areas of general agreement: the new membership and funding models. Notes that the funding model does not scale well when non-geographical associations join. (Humanistica and centerNet are not geographically based.) The spirit of NF's governance presentation today is to ask whether we can all agree on a framework that might work, even without details. Concerned that, if we can't agree today, the governance reforms

themselves are at real risk.

The “ADHO associations” document should be less controversial than the other.

NF proposes starting with points of agreement, and then discussing the more controversial ones; these are all included in the documents which have been previously distributed.

CM presents the effects of the existing model: power-sharing among COs, proportional voting, etc. Chose to focus on the financial one, exemplifying the problematics of our existing model by using JM’s “7 easy steps” to financial disbursement -- and what would happen at each step if ADHO’s growth were to proceed as it is currently. At each step, CM notes that the marginal increase in ADHO funds would be quickly depleted by a mere currency fluctuation, smaller pieces of the pie when more COs join, etc. (e.g. 2nd step in the existing model, to assign each CO a proportional share of the institutional & consortial subscription income. This is not a balanced system: this constitutes over 60% of ADHO’s overall income.)

The new model: flipping the current model on its head, reducing the distribution to 4 steps:

1) Assign all institutional income to ADHO; 2) assign all individual / joint memberships to the COs based on their share of total members, etc. CM says that this is the only feasible way forward, given the possibility of several new COs.

CM presents the decision logic for the new membership categories. This new logic solves a number of problems in the current system.

NF describes the new membership structure that has already been voted and approved by the SC, based on the idea that somebody makes a commitment to a single CO; if someone wants to make a commitment to another CO, that

should be a real choice, with financial consequences. SB asks how institutional memberships (in both centerNet and Humanistica) affect this model. KWa suggests that Jarom should take over the modeling of this effect. Unsure how centerNet institutions would feel about being treated as individuals. NF believe this aspect still requires some fine-tuning, but that it's not a deal-breaker. Should take a pilot approach, see how Humanistica and centerNet membership benefits are represented and used. (CC notes that Humanistica currently has 209 members, and that institutional members have no more rights than individual members.)

CM: There may be new situations that haven't been fully thought through. Might be best to ask those who are in a particular category which option would work best for them. Principle of treating an institutional member as if it were an individual may be simple and wise. DHD is frequently solicited by institutional members who want to send multiple people to conference at discounted rate, which CM finds to be unfair.

NF: Last summer we agreed in principle on this new financial model, but it was not put to vote.

CM: If we add new COs, membership and financial numbers will go up, but we need to distribute them more dynamically. This would have a negative effect on ADHO "central" finances, but a positive effect on CO finances. (This negative effect could be mitigated by ADHO running the conference as a revenue-generating stream, which it plans to do beginning with DH2018.) An alternative model (*not* being proposed) would be like the current AO/EADH one, to have COs write membership-based checks to ADHO. The most important innovation: requirement to choose your "home" CO in the new model. Later you can add more COs as secondary memberships. ADHO+ supporters also get conference discounts.

NF notes that all governance reforms are based on idea of giving more resources to the COs, making ADHO leaner, and focusing its support on

coordination activities.

BB asks whether the eventual payments to COs are going to be reduced. CM answers that this new system includes CO membership fees going directly to the COs, so that payments from ADHO to COs will be mostly eliminated. But of course the idea is that as the COs reach more members, as the DH market grows, the COs will reap the benefits directly.

OE notes that new financial model is not only practical, but also inherently good: it supports the organizations that actually feed it, and funds the activities that it does best, including financial handling of the conference.

LI agrees that this new model balances the inherent pressure to favor large organizations (since in current model, smaller organizations are more “expensive”).

NF: The central money, managed by ADHO, supports publication of the journals.

TT makes points about institutional subscriptions, which are sometimes required for use of research funds. Should take this into account. Also: if we adopt subscription-based numbers, we should determine what time of year the count is taken (e.g., because membership numbers generally grow around the time of the CO conference). Proposes something like “latest three years” smoothing calculation to account for these fluctuations.

NF proposes to continue the current practice of having a “floor” (minimal distribution to each CO) in the new model for the COs.

KWa would like to have more institutional subscriptions. ADHO+ supporter status still looks confusing to her.

OE notes relative difficulty of OUP membership pages as an impediment to membership, as compared with, e.g., the American MLA.

CM describes mockup of new membership page (considered during strategic planning meetings) with a targeted “ADHO+” donations marked specifically for student bursaries

NF: The new financial model is a precondition for the new governance model.

**NF motion: proposes us to accept the newly established flipped model, with changed nomenclature, and with the addition of “floor.” Passed unanimously.**

TC: calls for more transparent documentation and publicity of where membership money actually goes, since this is very murky for the vast majority of our membership.

CM: you pay your local CO in your local currency. That opens up the opportunity to gives COs to drive the financial organization in their local currency.

### **15:00 Conference bids DH2019 (120 minutes) (presentations and deliberations off-record)**

- 15:00 Utrecht
- 15:30 Graz
- 16:00 Dublin
- 16:30 Discussion & decision

**Decision: Utrecht**

### **Diversity issues on CO level (Karina, 30 minutes)**

- Informative round in which each CO presents what it has done during the

last year to address diversity issues, and what it is thinking of doing in the coming year

- KWa: centerNet has included diversity questions from its beginning: nominations cmte charged with creating a balanced slate of candidates, which works well given the very large executive council (20-25 members at any one time)
- SB: CSDH/SCHN has been struggling with linguistic diversity for a long time; Humanistica's entry is a CO is an indicator of a new stage in this struggle. More recently, CSDH/SCHN has produced a statement on inclusivity that is soon to be put to vote. CSDH/SCHN is weak in its own ethnic diversity, better in terms of gender.
- CM: EADH took the events of late 2015 as an impetus to take up the topic of diversity at its mid-year meeting. It views inclusivity not as an obligation, but as an asset. Outcome of the discussion was the adopted inclusivity statement, now published on the website; CM reported that EADH members were invited to comment on it. BB has taken on role of ombudsperson for EADH, though reports fairly minimal feedback. EADH is probably the most diverse organization in ADHO (in terms of languages, constituencies, etc.). Diversity is of great relevance. This is a very positive take, and EADH sees that as a more productive approach than the negative / regulatory approach.
- TT: JADH hasn't discussed the diversity issue yet, but will during its annual conference in September. TT will report this session back to JADH for consideration, and hopes to come up with a statement of its commitment and understanding within the next few months.

- SS: ACH views one of its primary strengths and points of pride as the thought and value it places on inclusivity and diversity. The letters sent to the SC on behalf of ACH in December 2015 represented an important expression both of ACH's active interest in diversity and inclusivity, and of its caution in not wanting to appear to be dictating its norms to ADHO. ACH is now working toward a publishable statement.
- aaDH is not represented at the meeting.
- General comments
  - DO - GO::DH has always diversity as an important aspect of its agenda. DO interprets relative lack of comment from GO::DH as a sign that it is comfortable with its own approach
  - TC notes that understanding of diversity and inclusivity will vary greatly depending which people are participating in the discussion
  - BB notes the domination of Europe and North America in the SC and on other ADHO governing bodies; GO::DH, on the other hand, feels like a safer, more inclusive space.
  - SS expresses appreciation to KvDO for putting diversity and inclusivity in such a prominent position on the SC's agenda.
  - NF expresses appreciation for honesty and depth of thought and expression on this issue.
- Informative discussion addressing diversity issues on ADHO level: BB will lead a mini-workshop on diversity and inclusivity as part of our Tuesday SC meeting.

## **17.00 Governance issues continued (30 minutes)**

- Decide on the agenda for the Tuesday morning meeting
- Decide what still has to be dealt with today

NF asks for more comments on the Governance documents between now and Tuesday, so that he and CM can get a better understanding of people's sense of agreement (or disagreement) on the general *framework*. NF notes that both he and CM will be leaving this work behind soon; with the membership and financial aspects resolved, if the governance framework can be agreed upon, it will be a great accomplishment.

There is a vote on a new governance framework which is important to be considered by the Steering Committee.

CM wants to support that and to offer 3 slides without discussing them, as a synopsis of the document; he invites everybody to read it first, rather than simply opening a new discussion. *Note that these three slides are contained in the "ADHO Governance Proposals" Word document (near the end) among the meeting documents.*

- 1) General philosophy structure of the organization. ADHO as the facilitator or umbrella body, the collaborative framework for international DH activities.
- 2) Governance structure: distinction between strategic-/policy-oriented activities from executive or operational ones. Distinction between Chair and President, as in EADH (though not simply a transplantation of the EADH system).

CM asks SC members to look with detail at the proposal, to ask questions, and to raise issues able to be discussed on Tuesday. Vital to have an agreement



on the framework, so that later people can implement it.

NF: We tried to reduce the number of committees wherever possible, and did it fairly successfully at the ADHO level, keeping those committees that remain as lean as possible.

**19.00 Adjourn**

**19:30 ADHO All-Execs dinner**

***Continuation: Tuesday, July 12, 9.30 - 13.00***

***Location: Collegium Paderevianum, Bldg A, Room 2***

**In attendance:**

- Paul Arthur (PA)
- Barbara Bordalejo (BB)
- Elisabeth Burr (EB)
- Fabio Ciotti (FC; non voting Membership officer)
- Arianna Ciula (AC)
- Claire Clivaz (CC) attending from 11:30 on
- Karina van Dalen-Oskam (KvDO)
- Oyvind Eide (OE)

- Neil Fraistat (NF)
- Matthew Gold (MG)
- Elena Gonzalez-Blanco (EG)
- Martin Grandjean (MG)
- Leif Isaksen (LI)
- Maurizio Lana (ML)
- Chris Meister (CM)
- Ray Siemens (RS)
- Michael Sinatra (MS)
- James Smithies (JS)
- Kay Walter (KWa)
- Kathy Weimer (KWe)
- Glen Worthey (GW)

**Voting members today:**

- MG (ACH)

- AC (EADH)
- CM (EADH)
- KWa (centerNet)
- NF (ACH)
- MS (CSDH/SCHN)
- BB (EADH)
- PA (aaDH)
- [JADH missing]

### **9:30 Introductions**

New members attending: Matt Gold (ACH), Martin Grandjean (Humanistica)

### **9:35 Committee and other reports (carried over from Sunday)**

#### **Awards Committee Report**

OE presents highlights of Awards report:

- A troubling continuous decline in nominations for major prizes
- An inspiring continuous increase in applications for bursaries -- which needs to be addressed with a more robust budget.

CM recalls previous discussions of new membership page encouraging “ADHO+” donations targeted specifically for student bursaries. General agreement that this is an excellent idea.

OE: Correction of report: Mark Algee-Hewitt led the Fortier Prize competition  
KW comments on centerNet’s own bursary program

OE praises centerNet’s (and other COs’ efforts) to give their own awards;  
ADHO Awards Cmte would like to hear about these, but does not at all feel the need to coordinate them.

### **Publications Committee Report**

LI proposes that instead of having an annual decision for a 5th issues of DSH, which has to be revised year after year, we should make this a permanent policy (as long as the cost does not increase for DSH).

CM reports that EADH supports this proposal.

**Motion to financially support a 5th (conference) open access issue of DSH.  
Unanimously accepted.**

LI proposes to add publication and licensing descriptions to the ADHO website. Journal editors have been discussing (low-level) various licensing practices. None feel the need to enforce a particular license model on their publications, but appreciate the forum for discussion.

LI notes that the structure of the Pubs Cmte is not well-suited to the tasks that are assigned to it. Notes that this point may be moot given the Governance Proposals (which includes a Publications officer rather than a committee); LI supports this idea as likely to help get Publications work accomplished more efficiently.

The DH abstracts project is now being developed; see the Publication Cmte’s written report. Welcomes feedback. He says he is not in the position to judge the success of this project. KvDO suggest that CS (as Infrastructure chair) may

be in a better position to judge. GW suggests that this project is not only about the technology platform, but also the presentation of the conference's intellectual content. AC suggests a combination of Infrastructure committee + local organizers.

KvDO to do: designate a person (e.g., CS/Infrastructure, combination of LOs) to follow up with DH abstracts team to evaluate phase 1+2, to get payment for that work, and to determine whether funding for a 3rd phase is needed.

### **DSH Reports and proposals (Chris)**

CM says they had Victoria Smith (our OUP rep) speaking about DSH at the EADH meeting yesterday. The gist of her report: the overall number of journal subscriptions has decreased slightly. The large decrease in individual subscriptions (expected after the "membership-only" option was instituted) have has been made up somewhat by a slight increase in institutional subscriptions. The journal publication process is working fine, smoothly, averaging now 6 weeks from final submission to publication. But there remains a big backlog of manuscripts.

Question about whether individual, online-only subscriptions are available, a question that has come up before with fairly negative response; this year, OUP appears to be much more positive and open to this possibility. CM feels that it will have a positive answer.

AC: Question from Victoria/OUP about whether or not the "membership only" fee should rise in parallel with the subscription price increases.

CM asks whether we really want to become bigger, or to raise more funds for ADHO? He suggests not to change this membership-only fee at the time being.

GW says that the membership-only fee includes the student fee, which we all agree should be kept as low as possible (even if the non-student membership-

only fees do eventually rise).

NF agrees that we should not move any fees while we're in the process of turning our entire financial structure upside-down. CM indicates that this would indeed complicate the process, and suggests not to change things.

FC defends the idea that this is not the moment to raise any fees. KvDO says there is consensus about this. **Action: inform OUP of this decision not to increase membership-only fee.**

GW notes that DHQ, which also has a substantial backlog, has suggested that increasing the editorial budget would alleviate that; is DSH in a similar situation? CM reminds of the discussion in Sydney to have a 6th (open-access) number. CM suggests this in order to raise the visibility of DSH and to reduce the backlog, and is still in favor of this. Asks us to remember that DSH is really our "cash cow", so we should certainly continue to invest in it. KvDO asks whether we can decide this now? CM/AC: no, we really need the editor to make such a proposal, and to be present in the discussion.

Impact factor ratings have been stable (although there will be an expected dip in impact factor because of the title change). It takes about two years to rebound the ranking.

CM notes that expectations about open access are unreasonably high. DSH is a very good journal, even though it costs money.

#### **9.45 Governance (Neil, 1 hour)**

- Recap of Sunday discussion

On Sunday we already approved the new financial recommendations. The recommendations fleshed out some specific questions: NF makes suggestion to pay attention to the overall framework for now. They asked people to

comment on the wiki and to divide the questions on two parts: things that people had approved and reservations about it. Some (but not many) people commented and NF thanks them for the comments, as everybody recognizes and appreciates the new model which will let us do ADHO business more efficiently.

Main reservation: Communication between the 2 structures (Executive Secretariat and COs Board). NF notes that GW had a good suggestion: the Secretariat should support the COs Board as well as the Chair. NF proposes that ADHO should move to Trello. It will help us to move more efficiently but also more transparently.

NF and CM hope to come to agreement **\*today\*** on the framework, acknowledging that implementation will have to happen separately.

CM recaps the diagram of ADHO new organization proposal. General idea: to distinguish between “day-to-day, operational” activities (which should be handled quickly and efficiently), and “strategic/policy” activities (which should be decided by the COs, represented by the CO Board).

Obviously, streamlining an organization requires some flattening -- and that in turn means that the COs become responsible for their own destiny, and ADHO is facilitating only in those areas where it makes sense to facilitate.

Most committees are suggested to become much smaller (and non-representational); others would be abolished and replaced by a single officer. (One exception to this is the Awards Cmte, which should always have all COs represented, because it's the only committee which has decision power in disbursing funds.)

The 8 little blocks under the secretariat, are the Committees: SIGs, Awards, Admissions...

The Chair is responsible for the Executive, day-to-day activities; the President exonerates the Chair, and leads the CO Board.

The CO Board represents not only COs, but also SIGs and AOs (in a way to be determined); it

Should not be proportional, but rather consist of one voting member per CO.

This makes sense in the newly adopted funding model: every CO owns its own destiny in terms of revenue (ADHO is not gathering any money any longer), so there are no longer resources to divide.

NF says that our current two-person secretariat should continue, being all the more necessary now that it will support both new parts (the Executive/Organizational part and the Scholarly/Strategic part) of a complex organization. Proposes also a Treasurer and a Deputy Treasurer, as this would make that difficult work more doable.

MS praises the excellent work of the Governance committee who developed this simplified, streamlined governance model. Asks question about whether rotating committee membership might work well? CM says this is a great suggestion: to identify new people to serve every 3 years or so.

NF suggests that COs should also be encouraged to co-opt people outside their Executives to work on ADHO committees.

OE points out that on Awards Committee, the situation is that the principal decisions generally have to be checked with the President and ADHO Chair (because of their potentially political nature), but it is good to formalize this, to have somebody outside the executive committee to assume the formal parts of the process.



FC suggests from a strategic point of view, the “promotion of DH worldwide” aspect is a very important one.

NF points out that they wrote the document for internal purposes, but it is important to be transparent and show members the organization as soon as possible. **Action item for Secretariat: When implementation of governance reforms begins, we should ensure reflection on how our internal organization appears to the outside world.**

FC urges us to think about the side effects of one-rep-per-CO: what if there were a coalition of smaller COs who outvoted the single rep of a larger CO?

NF: The proposal is agnostic on this issue, and this is not a subject of debate today; implementation is a crucial issue that we have to work on. He asks not to work on this today, as today this is only for presentation.

BB: Worried about streamlining, because of the homogeneity of the SC. If we want to be more inclusive, the CO Board should be open to other kinds of inclusion.

MS asks for clarification, thinking of Humanistica with 250 members. He wants to know if we will vote now on behalf of Humanistica, and how its voting power will be reflected on these committees. CM notes that it’s still possible for one person to have multiple votes, if we opt for the proportionality model.

Recommends that this vital aspect is still to be investigated and discussed further.

FC likes the idea of having representative of AOs, and would like to extend the forum currently used in EADH to the global level -- e.g., so that all the regional AOs around the world join in a global forum (of course this is dependent on the idea of AOs extending to other areas of the world). Suggests to avoid small-scale national conflicts. NF notes that there’s a separate document discussing

this.

FC: membership. We could establish a membership sub-secretary (not being necessary a member of the Executive Board). This might allow the elimination of the membership committee.

RS: general thoughts: gratitude to all for working through these proposals (including especially Harold). Notes that we always talk about change, and about how we work together. ADHO's very first set of governance protocols was modified immediately after implementation! The current proposals recognize the need for a new way to interact, but they should be nuanced, flexible, and subject to change.

NF hopes that the framework is durable and people begin to appreciate it.

KWe is confused about how a member would figure out how to participate and constitute a group able to take on an intellectual problem. Much more than a SIG. CM insists that ADHO is not a home for individual members, but for COs. CO is the first port of call for a member's concerns or interests. If an issue is concerned with something that ADHO leads (e.g., the conference), then an ADHO would be the next port of call. SIGs are ideal and flexible instruments for particular concerns, that do not fall over administrative structures. ADHO is the facilitator for SIGs. It is a much more flexible mechanism. NF concurs, adding that SC has discussed that ADHO has become too top-heavy, and that there is a need to return to the COs (and to grass-roots efforts like SIGs).

FC describes experience in DARIAH infrastructure. Bottom-up working groups which get approval, but then never meet, never get anything done. He suggests that the mechanisms for SIGs will be similar to this. NF notes that the "Associations" document includes discussion of the place of SIGs and AOs.

KvDO asks for a motion to adopt; NF suggests such a motion, which KWa makes:

- Approval of the framework as written be adopted
- Determination (by KvDO) of an implementation committee and plan (which would take up the Associations document)

PA seconds it. Unanimously supported.

NF and KvDO thank everybody.

#### **10.45 Committee and officer appointments (15 minutes)**

- Voting members of various COs

KVdO says that, after CO meetings yesterday, some of the voting members of the SC have changed, as follows:

- aADH does not have new voting members.
- ACH Jen Guiliano and Tanya Clement will be the new voting members.
- centerNet: Paul Arthur will be the voting member, and Kay Walter an observer.
- CSDH: Susan Brown
- EADH Elisabeth Burr, new President (will take the place of Barbara on the SC), and OE as new Chair. AC will remain as a third voting member.

The EADH representation has consequences for Awards committee, as OE steps down as Awards Committee Chair (though will be happy to help whoever

takes over). OE says that there is no important business in the next few months. It is not necessary to appoint somebody right away, but soon would be good.

- Appointment of Committee Chairs
  - Awards Cmte Chair needed -- not identified
  - No other committee chairs needed at this time
  
- Appointment of ADHO SC Chair

GW recounts our process of having an open call for chair. Notes that there was one other nominee who declined, leaving Karina's nomination as the only one. KvDO recuses herself for this discussion.

**GW presents KvDO as the sole nominee. Unanimously approved.**

KvDO rejoins the committee and thanks the committee for its support.

- Appointment of ADHO Foundation President and Secretary

KvDO explains briefly how the ADHO Foundation works. Located in the Netherlands primarily for financial and legal purposes.

GW explains why current roles are reversed (i.e., with KvDO as Secretary, and he as President of the Foundation): after John Nerbonne's resignation, GW was selected to take on his role, and KvDO simply remained in her previous role. BB asks the meaning of these roles. KvDO says that the only requirement of the Foundation officers is that they have one meeting per year with an agenda; this coincides with the annual SC meeting. The Foundation makes it possible for people to make donations, but there are not greater plans for it at the moment.

GW announces that his position as Secretary will last not very much longer, and that he should now step down as Foundation President. NF suggests that EG be appointed Foundation Secretary, given her longer future term in the SC Secretariat.

AC moves that EG become Secretary of the Foundation; KWa adds friendly amendment that KvDO be designated President of the Foundation. NF seconds. All are in favor.

### **11.00 Coffee break**

### **11.15 Mini-workshop on Diversity (Barbara, 1 hour)**

Concepts:

- Implicit bias
- Cultural cloning
- Privilege
- Intersectionality

Barbara's slides will be posted in the Meeting Documents.

MG: Makes a motion that the SC commit to sponsoring and holding a similar workshop (or forum) on diversity at the next DH conference (in Montreal), details to be determined. Passed unanimously.

### **12.15 Wrap-up**

- Resumption of unfinished topics: none determined

- Review of financial impact of decisions made:
  - Infrastructure Cmte request to hire consultant for membership management system
  - 3rd stage of DH Abstracts project to be funded (pending review of stages 1+2)
  - Humanistica's financial impact will be felt next year.
  - Subsidy for DSH 5th issue

KvDO notes that she is now completing John Nerbonne's term, and asks that we consider acknowledging John's many and important contributions during his time as Chair.

**KWa moves that the SC formally thank John Nerbonne for his great contributions to ADHO during his service as ADHO SC Chair. Passed unanimously by voting members, and joined unanimously by the non-voting members present.**

KvDO thanks everybody for their participation, and especially Barbara for this morning's workshop on diversity.

**Meeting adjourns at 12:47.**