

# Minutes: ADHO Steering Committee Meeting, 2017 (Montreal)

***NB: This version of the Minutes is a slightly redacted version produced for publication on the ADHO website. -GW***

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

- aaDH, 1 vote: Sarah Kenderdine
- ACH, 2 votes: Jen Guiliano, Tanya Clement
- centerNet, 1 vote: Kay Walter (Sunday); Paul Arthur (Tuesday)
- CSDH/SCHN, 1 vote: Susan Brown
- EADH, 3 votes: Barbara Bordalejo, Elisabeth Burr, Øyvind Eide
- Humanistica, 1 vote: Martin Grandjean
- JADH, 1 vote: Tomoji Tabata

## ***Attendance: officers, committee chairs, CO representatives (with identifying initials for these minutes)***

- Chair: Karina van Dalen-Oskam - **KDO**
- Treasurer: Jarom McDonald - **JM**
- Secretaries: Hannah Jacobs - **HJ**, Glen Worthey - **GW**
- Membership Coordinator: Fabio Ciotti - **FC**
- SIG Liaison: Kathy Weimer - **KWe**
- Publications Cmte Chair: Leif Isaksen - **LI**
- CCC Chair: Claire Clivaz - **CC**
- Infrastructure Chair: Christof Schöch - **CS**
- MLMC Chair: Maurizio Lana (Tuesday) - **ML**
- Admissions Cmte Chair: Ray Siemens (Sunday) - **RS**
- aaDH rep: Sarah Kenderdine - **SK**
- ACH reps: Jen Guiliano - **JG**, Tanya Clement - **TC**, Matt Gold - **MGo**
- centerNet reps: Kay Walter (Sunday) - **KWa**, Paul Arthur (Tuesday) - **PA**
- CSDH/SCHN rep: Susan Brown - **SB**
- EADH rep: Barbara Bordalejo - **BB**, Elisabeth Burr - **EB**, Øyvind Eide - **OE**
- Humanistica rep: Martin Grandjean - **MGr**
- JADH rep: Tomoji Tabata - **TT**
- DHASA observer (Tuesday): Juan Steyn - **JS**
- TADH observer (Tuesday): Muh-Chyun Tang - **MCT**

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

- Motion that we develop an ADHO Code of Conduct (as an extension of the current *Conference Code*) that is presented to the COs for approval.
- Motion for adoption of wording to be added to our Conference Code of Conduct particular to DH2017, to be sent to all participants & read at opening plenary. Proposed and accepted wording is as follows:

“For this conference, please contact Diane Jakacki or Karina van Dalen-Oskam if you feel unsafe. We will in confidence listen, discuss, and advise, and if necessary address the issue with all people involved. We will then decide on the best course of action. Sometimes an informal resolution may be possible. In other cases, we may have to take formal action up to and including ejection from the conference, and advising the Steering Committee to consider further measures.”

- Confirming (by stipulation) voting membership of ADHO SC for 2017-2018, proportional to number of members: the same pattern of representation and voting membership will remain as currently constituted.
  - aaDH: - 1 member
  - ACH: - 2 members
  - EADH: - 3 members
  - centerNet: - 1 member
  - CSDH/SCHN - 1 member
  - JADH - 1 member
  - Humanistica - 1 member
- Motion to admit the Digital Humanities Association of Southern Africa (DHASA) into observer status as an ADHO CO.
- Motion to admit the Taiwanese Association of Digital Humanities (TADH) into observer status as an ADHO CO.
- Motion to admit “Digital Literary Stylistics” as a Special Interest Group of ADHO.
- Motion to accept as a roadmap the Infrastructure Committee proposal on conference abstracts and reviewer data.
- Selection of Ottawa as host city for DH2020.
- Motion that both the money already allocated for Convalidator (€ 2k), and an additional € 2k for further development, be approved. (NB: this motion was later amended to a total of € 3,960; see below.)
- Motion that 4000 € be allocated for the CiviCRM installation by DHd, as an experiment meant to benefit all of ADHO.
- Election of new Committee Chair and SC Officers
  - Sara Sikes elected as Deputy Treasurer
  - Brian Croxall and Maciej Eder elected as Secretaries

- Eveline Wandl-Vogt elected as Awards Committee Chair
- Ashley Sanders elected as Publications Committee Chair
- Candice Lanius and Pietro Santachiara elected as Communications Committee Co-Chairs (after motion to creation co-chair position for Communications Committee)
- Motion to stay the voting for Membership Officer, given single candidate; concurrent motion to create an ad-hoc Membership Cmte to work for one year.
- Motion that ADHO authorize a seed grant to Humanistica (and its journal) for € 3,000.
- Motion that ADHO authorize € 3,960 for work on the DHConvalidator.
- Confirmation of ADHO budget's ability to provide € 15,541 to DH2018 LOs as an advance toward conference costs (coming from budget reserves), as previously committed.

#### **List of Action Items (noted in green in the text)**

- The SC requests a more formal proposal from Humanistica for financial support of its journal.
- The Implementation Committee suggested to consider the possibility of a proliferation of SIGs.
- OUP requested to provide a pricing quote for individual online-only subscriptions to DSH.
- KDO to ask SIGs and COs to provide a list of particular questions or issues they believe need to be addressed by the Implementation Committee.
- KDO and new Secretariat to discuss and decide on who would be willing to serve (if elected) as new ADHO Foundation Secretary.
- The COs and AOs will be asked by the Website Group (of the Communications Committee) for a liaison (or liaisons) from various language communities to help with translation of the ADHO website.

## ***Sunday, 6 August, 9:00-17:00***

**Location: Library Research Commons A, McGill Library (3459 McTavish St.)**

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

- OFFICERS PRESENT: Karina van Dalen-Oskam (President), Jarom McDonald (Treasurer); ABSENT: Elena Gonzalez-Blanco (Secretary)

## 9.00 Coffee and greetings

### 9.30 Welcome (Karina, 10 minutes)

- Welcome by ADHO Chair (Karina)
- Introductions
  - Noted that Harold Short and Ray Siemens are not able to represent the Admissions Committee for all the meetings, but Ray will attend briefly to present its report and recommendations.
- KDO: last year's minutes are not presented for approval, but believes its action items should all appear in this year's agenda. If there are comments from last year's agenda during today's discussion, please raise them at the point of discussion

### 9.40 Chair's report (Karina) (20 minutes)

- Discussion by the Steering Committee of an identified need for a more formal protocol for handling complaints based on the Conference Code of Conduct (which outlines expectations, but lacks concrete procedures). KDO has proposed a special set of procedures for use only at the DH2017 conference, and has discussed and refined it with local organizers; would now like to consult with the SC whether its wording is appropriate in tone and scope. *[See approved wording below.]*
  - BB: Advocates for a more formal process to draft this important document. KDO: The current procedure was drafted quickly in response to a request for more clarity, but it should indeed be refined later. Notes that local McGill authorities seem to consider campus guests as a gray area regarding enforcement.
  - SB: Notes that she finds the wording of the procedure to be appropriate. Asks whether ADHO actually has the right to ban someone from the conference space, as indicated? KDO: Yes, as long as we announce that possibility in our statement. Proposed phrasing will be sent to participants via Conftool, it will be mentioned in the opening, and posted to the conference website.
  - CC: Is it possible to have a phone number available to call in emergencies? That was the case at the DH2014, with 24h access to safety. KW asks who took those calls, and what was the result of a call? CC: It went to a central alarm center at the University of Lausanne at the DH2014, and was considered a good solution.
  - JG proposes including the text of the Code of Conduct *before* people submit proposals in ConfTool -- require reading and acknowledging the CoC at that point.
  - BB: Would like to see refinement of wording of these procedures for future conferences.

- KDO would like to see Conference Code of Conduct extended as an *ADHO* Code of Conduct. SB: Would it be binding on all the COs? That would require us to agree that it applies to all collectively. Notes that since there's no way to "kick someone out of ADHO," it would have to be. TC and JG note that this would require a change of bylaws for ACH, which could be done, but would take a while. LI: Mechanics of coming to agreement will necessarily be complex.
- **KWa: Moves that we develop an ADHO Code of Conduct (as an extension of the current *Conference* Code) that is presented to the COs for approval. Seconded (SK, EB) and passed unanimously.**
- BB would like us to be clear in the drafting of language for this year's code of conduct procedure that cultural differences are not an excuse for unacceptable behaviors. SB notes that it is up to ADHO to determine its norms, regardless of cultural explanations or excuses. SB notes that we should simply "hope that in most cases an informal resolution would be possible" -- while removing any sort of "cultural escape clause." Group agrees that we should focus on "informal" and "formal" resolutions of any complaints. MGo asks about the "in confidence" phrase: are we really able to promise that? KDO prefers to keep the possibility of confidentiality at the discretion of the complainant. JG hopes we might add language relating ADHO policy to local enforcements; KDO notes if this becomes part of ADHO Foundation documentation, it gives a stronger platform for enforcing across various locales.
- **After detailed discussion of some phrasing in the original statement, BB moves that the new proposed wording for DH2017 Code of Conduct be accepted, sent out to all participants & read at opening plenary. Second - JG, EB. Vote unanimous.**

**New wording as proposed and accepted:** "For this conference, please contact Diane Jakacki or Karina van Dalen-Oskam if you feel unsafe. We will in confidence listen, discuss, and advise, and if necessary address the issue with all people involved. We will then decide on the best course of action. Sometimes an informal resolution may be possible. In other cases, we may have to take formal action up to and including ejection from the conference, and advising the Steering Committee to consider further measures."

**Current CofC:** <http://dh2017.adho.org/about/code/>

10.00 **Treasurer's report** + ADHO Budget **2017** and 2018 (Jarom, 45 minutes)

- JM: Just updated an emended version of the high-level report to the meeting documents page, having discovered some conversion errors, as

well as some possible figures incorrectly reported by OUP. Also just uploaded a detailed spreadsheet of budget and expenses. Please don't publish these, although it is okay to share with CO execs; not that it's confidential, but rather that the full spreadsheet requires context and explanation.

- JM: 2016 expenses all recorded and accounted for, in spite of a few months this past year of less-active management of the treasury.
- JM: Last year the decline of the GBP pound affected our budget (since we receive income in GBP, but do all our business in Euros). Last year we decided to make up for this by not contributing to our Reserve Fund, which is quite healthy, but included in CO disbursements. Now that the situation has stabilized somewhat, JM proposes doing the same this year.
- JM recommends that the basic allotments (to COs and to budget items) not change this year. JM considers the relative stability of the budget to be a minor advantage -- but certainly believes that new budget proposals should be welcomed, since the budget is healthy. KDO suggests that we gather the budget requirements during our meetings this week.
- OE: Thanks for sharing the full detailed spreadsheet! Asks about "individual members" (line 11); are these subscriptions? JM: Yes, these are subscriptions; line 13 contains the non-subscription memberships. OE asks for clarification about where income from AOs is shown on the spreadsheet; only some of these members pay through OUP. JM and OE note that in the new ADHO financial model, this money stays in the CO, with the exception of € 5 per member transferred to ADHO.
- MGr: Asks about handling of Humanistica funds this year, both the disbursement and support for the journal. The question of journal support is on the agenda, but the question of disbursement is not (and not mentioned in JM documents). MGr notes that Humanistica doesn't have an urgent need for a budget infusion this year, but wants to keep the question open.
- SB: Joining through OUP continues to be an issue. Is new membership mechanism in discussion? CS & FC will provide updates in their reports. KDO notes that this also has implications in the governance reform implementation, so we should not hurry with it. CS notes that there are other financial implications of working on a new membership system that will be discussed later today.
- EB asks about (line 67) EADH and ACH disbursements as shown; JM clarifies that this year, ACH disbursement is slightly higher than EADH (not accounting for the extra Affiliation Org income that comes into EADH). OE clarifies that AO income stays in EADH, minus 5 Euros that go to ADHO for infrastructure support -- and that these budget numbers

don't reflect the actual cash flow within ADHO. JM will work to include those AO numbers. FC can provide more details -- JM, OE, FC to discuss further separately.

- EB asks about subscription distribution around the world? FC says OUP's business model is set, and not really subject to influence by ADHO. JG: ACH membership model does not provide reporting flexibility (reflecting the confusion of the OUP interface, leading many potential ACH members to choose the simpler "joint membership w/o subscription". ACH would like to see a biannual report from OUP & membership to assist with mid-year requests. OE hesitates to recommend a "wait and see" approach -- but does hope that the new membership model will make things easier to see and understand. JG: one challenge is that ACH sees the OUP report only in mid-cycle, but the money comes in at the beginning of the cycle, and accounting is done at the end.
- JG: general question related to Humanistica: why does ADHO subvene CO publications directly, rather than returning a larger portion of income to the COs to distribute to their publications as they see fit. JM: initially ADHO offered only a subvention to DHQ as a way to show strong, general support for ADHO's open-access journal (in addition to its revenue-generating journal). JG expresses concern that this model means that less money comes to the COs for other projects (e.g. non-traditional publications). KDO: issue should be addressed by Implementation Committee. OE: Relates to question about ADHO's position as superstructure or cooperative. Would like to see phrasing that ensures DHQ remains journal for whole community. FC: Who has ownership for DHQ? JG: ACH does, but it's complicated: there is very little ACH or ADHO branding on the journal, for example. Since DHQ receives such substantial support coming from the top (pre-distribution portion) of the ADHO budget (which otherwise could be disbursed directly to ACH), should it not represent ADHO more explicitly (with regard to branding, boards, etc.)?
- KWe: The SIGs have existed for 4 years now, with absolutely no budgetary allotment. Would like to keep the topic on the table for conversation. KDO notes that this is also on the list for the Implementation Committee. Harold and JM will be present during those discussions, and have been asked specifically to have a close look at SIG support.
- KDO: Is still unclear about when the "goodwill disbursement" to Humanistica is to have been made. (RS still not present, so it's difficult to reconstruct those agreements.) JM recalls that the agreement was that the first formal disbursement would come at DH2018; but the

traditional “goodwill disbursement” as seed funding could come this year. JM suggests that this would be a good idea, but doesn’t feel empowered to make a motion to do that.

- OE suggests that ADHO consider offering the traditional 3000 Euro disbursement for 2017 to help get them integrated into the ADHO infrastructure, then for 2018 the disbursement would be calculated as with other COs. (Clarification: All Humanistica members will subscribe through OUP starting in 2018; so far they have subscribed directly with Humanistica, so their membership income has not been included in the general ADHO budget.) This will all be discussed on Tuesday.
- JG asks about the DH2018 request for conference funding; JM reminds us of the 2015 decision for ADHO to underwrite the conference generally; Montreal had the option of hosting under that model, but has chosen not to use it, so Mexico City will be the first conference of which ADHO becomes the major underwriter, supporting venue fees, publicity, etc., and also bears any losses. LI asks for clarification that our reserves are sufficient to avoid cash flow problems; JM confirms that this shouldn’t be a problem. SB asks whether the amount of the \$18K request (by the Mexico City hosts) was pre-determined? JM: No, that is a request specific to the circumstances of venue reservation. JG would like to know whether this is money that comes off the top of the disbursement? JM: This money could come either from the reserves, or from the annual budget. SB recommends that it be noted as an annual expense, to be clear about the annual obligations, rather than as a “special case”. FC suggests that the SC should now follow more closely the conference budgets. TC notes that it would be good to have more transparency with this, e.g., to know whether the COs have to pay for their own lunches at Membership Meetings, etc. KDO notes that the new financial model will provide precisely that kind of transparency and control of each CO over its own budget.
- LI: With ADHO assuming all financial risks, what are the consequences of poorly managing a conference budget, and what is the incentive to manage it well? Each year may be unpredictable. JM mentions that this idea came from the very first governance reforms discussion, having a liaison between ADHO & LOs year to year to check expenses, attendance numbers, etc. JM notes that this is still an experiment, and offers to work closely with DH2018 LOs for the coming year to begin this liaison practice. OE notes that the MOU for conference hosting includes more than just budget, but also specific points about specific ADHO’s requirements for the conference -- and thus should have a more specific advisory / oversight role.
- CS: if there is a 75/25 split, the LOs do have an incentive to be frugal



and responsible, and that ADHO should certainly have some say in conference expenses.

- JG: ADHO needs more explicit ongoing access to financial reports from LOs. JM agrees, adding that ADHO could also dictate certain practices, e.g., the use of ConfTool (rather than a local solution) for collection of registration fees.
- JM notes that having a Deputy Treasurer would put in place a way for JM to begin to step down after a much longer term than anticipated. The Deputy Treasurer would then become Treasurer in 2018 with JM serving as DT, then in 2019 JM would step away. [Nominees](#) for Deputy Treasurer will be discussed and decided upon on Tuesday. ML suggests that we need current officers to write better guidelines about their roles before there is any handoff; KDO notes that we do have terms of reference, but they are very general. GW notes that Chair & Secretariat have invited some nominees with whom we are not yet personally familiar to meet with us on Monday, before selection for these roles; suggests that Jarom might also join in this if able.
- **Confirming (by stipulation) voting membership of ADHO SC for 2017-2018, proportional to number of members: the same pattern of representation and voting membership will remain as currently constituted.**
  - **aaDH: - 1 member**
  - **ACH: - 2 members**
  - **EADH: - 3 members**
  - **centerNet: - 1 member**
  - **CSDH/SCHN - 1 member**
  - **JADH - 1 member**
  - **Humanistica - 1 member**

OE notes that this is the final year of this governance structure anyway.

10.45 Committee reports & discussion (Part 1: 5 minutes each)

- [Multilingualism/Multiculturalism Committee](#) (ML)

ML: Main activity of MLMC has been focusing on a multilingual ADHO website; movement has been slow, but the committee to discuss that site is meeting this week. Suggests that MLMC protocol should be changed to allow it to act more autonomously in making proposals, i.e., to act on its own initiatives, not simply to respond to requests from the SC. EB suggests that MLMC itself can draft a proposal to change its own protocol, and ask SC to approve it. ML will indeed do that, after the website meeting.

- [Communications Committee](#) (HJ)

HJ: The main points are that we now have a web developer who is making

great strides in fixing problems with the website, and he will be integral to the conversation about the multilingual website, as well as accessibility. The Communication Fellows program is going strong, the number and quality of the applications has increased a lot, and they're doing great work (especially during the week of the conference). KDO notes that the Fellows have even been the source of self-nominations (e.g., for Communications Officer), which is a great thing.

- [Publications Committee](#) (LI)

LI: There are 2 reports from DSH, one from [OUP](#) & one from [editors](#). The committee existed largely in name last year, since the various journal editors who make it up were most focused on their own individual publications. Suggests we might want to change how this operates through the Implementation Committee. As regards DSH, its subscriptions remain stable with a slight uptick. Notable shift to digital downloads as opposed to print subscriptions. "Rest of the world & Asia" are featured significantly -- it's hard to know how much bundling of library subscriptions accounts for this. E.g., China comes in at 4th place in number of downloads, and Taiwan is close behind. Anglophone countries are heavily represented as "publishing" as opposed to "reading". Not that ADHO needs to intervene to change this, but we should note it.

JG: ACH has addressed the publication and tenure question, and the importance of alt-metrics. Can OUP address this? OE recommends waiting for Victoria's OUP visit on Tuesday to discuss this further.

LI: Notes that questions of journal subventions and invoicing will be addressed next year.

11.00 Break

11.30 Conference reports (60 minutes)

- **DH2017 Local Organizer Report (Michael - MS, Cecily - CR, Stéfan - SS, 20 minutes)**

SS: Welcome to Montreal! Introduction of other Local Organizers MS and CR; Domenic Forêt is currently in a session with conference volunteers. Will follow (very informally) the template of what will be the final report.

- Recommendations to CCC for future conferences:

- Conftool worked well for payment with the exception of the currency setting. Make sure future LOs understand how to set that! One downside: registration refunds should be strongly discouraged, since

they're so hard to process; had to say officially that refunds are not possible, and only make exceptions in extreme cases.

- Posters: struggled to find enough boards & space for all the accepted posters. Perhaps future LOs may want to coordinate better with PC on how many posters are physically possible. It's still a great way to present & exchange research, but may need to have multiple sessions and/or a cap on number of posters.
- Does a reception for everyone still make sense? Notes that the traditional all-execs event this evening is not a dinner, as in the past, but rather a simpler reception, allowing for more interaction and lower expense. One major problem with having receptions for all attendees is the difficulty in estimating attendance, ordering food, etc.
- Abstracts: light-weight editing process. All have had issues with ConValidator & requested instead Word or OpenOffice files (but not PDF!) to allow for simple editing and normalization. Harmonization for appearance was the main goal. The challenging question: Do you put more responsibility on the contributors, or on the organizers, for normalization of abstracts?
- Timing for Workshops with their own CfP was a difficulty; deadlines and decisions must be made before registration opens, to avoid people registering then learning that they weren't accepted for a workshop.
- Conference timing in August has gone well. Close to 860 registrants (so far), indicating that many can indeed attend at this time of year, in spite of previous doubts.
- A very difficult issue: the banquet dress code that sparked a lively social media "conversation," which seems to have been resolved.
- Related social media issues: we should clarify the difference between making critiques and comments and just being nasty; it's a question of professionalism. SS strongly recommends that we be more involved in setting expectations, and in reacting as a community when someone (e.g., the LOs) are attacked.
- Virtual Stream: Response not as strong as anticipated. Notes that this may not be a success for this conference but would like to continue to experiment with this option for speakers.
- In the spirit of avoiding wastage, the LOs have chosen not to pass out registration kits with swag, but rather only the minimum of a name tag, plus a single-page handout of instructions.
- What went well:
  - Collaboration with PC chair was incredibly helpful -- the most important aspect of which is that Diane worked extremely hard! There has also been some movement among responsibilities (what belongs to LOs,

what to the PC), and this mix will probably be different at future conferences, but should be noted.

- Expanding to team of 4 LOs has worked very well. More explicit roles needed to be established, but this collaboration has been rewarding.
- Mobile app is promising, but there are still some problems with some scheduling issues, still to be resolved. Recommendation to continue this in future years.
- Recommends being aggressive about maintaining the very low price-point and relying as much as possible on university infrastructure; McGill's infrastructure has been essential to keeping the costs low.

Difficulties that could have been avoided:

- A lot of side requests always arise -- from individual projects, funders needing additional support or space -- but these are not always easy to manage. Risk crossing the line of favoritism when certain requests are honored, and others aren't. Recommends drawing clear guidelines about this.
- Bilingualism: We have done a lot but could have done more. Most emails have been English-only, on the one hand, but on the other hand, most of website is bilingual, and everyone who addressed the LOs in French received support in French.
- Doubts remain about the arrangement for splitting revenue between ADHO and LOs. SS believes that it has been helpful for the LOs to know that they will reap benefits of surplus, especially in the 2017 case (with two hosting institutions); encourages us to have conversations with future LOs to determine whether that split is truly optimal, and what will motivate best choices for the conferences.
- JM notes that this topic came up earlier today, so a follow-up question: would it be more appropriate to have just a different split, e.g. 50/50? Or use some other principle of revenue sharing? SS: not sure, but perhaps a more complex formula, e.g., up to a certain amount one split, beyond that a different split. 50/50 seems more reasonable to SS personally, but thinks a more nuanced discussion is needed. MS notes that, if their previous bid had been accepted, the conference budget would have been about double. Every decision has financial implications. They did receive some generous support from all the host institutions, but the possibility of return on their investment was important to them, and a smaller possible return may have led to less willingness to invest.
- Need to consider split on case-by-case basis? LI: Whatever the arrangement is, should it be symmetrical between ADHO & LO? SS: problem comes with losses. Where does money come from for loss? An ADHO backstop is important in this case, and it would be difficult to keep

split symmetrical in that case. With year-to-year growth in participation, need to continually reconsider these financial aspects. The LOs knew they would be fine in terms of registration numbers a few months ago, which allowed them to be more flexible in last-minute decisions -- so live monitoring of registration numbers and more discussion with LOs are essential.

- CC: Big thanks from CCC on the great work of LOs. Question about seeing abstracts on the website.

SS: As of last Friday, the full volume (800+ pp.) of abstracts has been available. SB: Link to app is also not clear. SS: Look under "Program"; links available on main page. CR notes that it was a conscious decision to keep to one page.

- MS: Finances. Grant from SSHRC offered important help as well as LO institutional support. High-level budget summary:

75K catering; 12K plenary speakers; 10K rooms, security, facilities; 6K poster board rental; 5K book of abstracts; tax added on. Estimating 100K final revenue to be calculated in October when all bills are paid.

- All questions about this report (and website, and where to find what) are welcome!

- **DH2017 PC Report (Diane - DJ) (20 minutes)**

- Many thanks for constructive guidance from LOs and from CCC and SC
- Proudest accomplishment of the PC: Greatly increased reviewer pool (700) -- wanted to recognize that there are many more voices in DH than are represented in conference. Also facilitate better understanding of reviewing process. It was great to formally, officially be allowed to expand this reviewer pool. The requirements for reviewers were very common-sense and generous (e.g., allowing anyone who had presented in a DH conference to be eligible to review). Almost doubled the number of previous reviewers, which had a lot of good benefits: shared workload, more reviewers per proposal, relief of the PC members for last-minute reviews (which had always happened before).
- 593 submissions. 444 accepted in some way (including acceptance in a different category than proposed). 401 are presenting in some form. 40 withdrawals. It appears that the acceptance rate [75% overall] is slightly higher than in previous years, but clarification requires more fine-tuning of the numbers.

- Notes that the higher acceptance rate means more parallel tracks; the PC capped the concurrent sessions at 9 (and several slots have only 6-7 concurrent sessions), and also chose to have a slightly longer day (8am start) to accommodate the greater numbers of presentations. This was also occasioned by the much longer lunch required by not having catering.
- 16 workshops that are running as we speak, including 2 that are SIG-endorsed workshops, at least 10 of which are at maximum capacity. Workshops continue to be a very important part of the program, even though they're one of the most complicated things to schedule. JG asks whether it might make sense, as the conference grows and workshops continue to be popular, to have a separate group or subgroup of the PC that would be responsible for workshops? DJ: seems potentially useful. MS notes that the special requests generally came not from workshop organizers, but from funding agencies, etc. DJ notes that some workshop activities are truly special, and very important (e.g., pedagogy summit, and diversity workshop), and need to be treated specially. TC asks whether review process for workshops needs to be different, so as not to repeat them too often.
- What worked:
  - Changed the term "rebuttal" to "response" for review process -- recognizing the dialogue between submitters and reviewers. No expectation to change review based on response, but in some cases it did lead to changes in review numbers and revised comments.
  - Opt-in basis for PC work (rather than requiring a vote for every decision): allowed some people on the PC to be very engaged in dialog, and others to respond more simply and briefly.
  - Social media: High level of engagement in DH on social media, which has been very constructive in many cases (e.g., finding reviewers and session chairs). Social media can be used for gathering resources. But there's also a downside. The back channel will always be there, though we would like to encourage more professionalism on it.
- What didn't work:
  - Conftool bidding system: Those who said they'd review 5 received many; those who said they'd review 15 received few/none.
  - Keyword system really needs to be reworked: vocabulary needs to be constrained, in order to take advantage of

- ConfTool's automated review assignments.
        - DJ wishes the multilingual communications had been more consistent, but that's a lot of work.
    - BB (again, as last year) suggests an open peer review system and special recognition for those who do a lot of reviews
    - Things to consider for 2018:
      - Travel: DJ received many requests for visa letters. Not enough time for many participants to arrange visas. Need to start the process earlier, and make it more open.
      - More people with less funding would like to attend the conference. Need to plan for increasing difficulty for emerging scholars to attend future conferences.
        - MS notes that substantially lower cost for grad students has meant a larger number of students attending DH2017.
      - Posters will continue to be a challenge. As presentation mode especially in DH, some robust projects are best presented in poster form (as opposed to other fields in which posters may be viewed as smaller or more minor projects). Need 2 PC Chairs. Workload is too much for 1.
    - The number of presenters as reported in ConfTool appears strange: many people counted as author on a submission, even when people who don't intend to present are counted. This makes scheduling difficult, e.g., if not everyone listed as an author actually needs to be at a presentation. JG suggests that Presenter/Author selection in ConfTool needs to be implemented more explicitly.
    - CC: Reiteration of enormous thanks to LOs and DJ!
- **DH2018 LO Pre-conference Report (Isabel Galina - IG, Miriam Peña - MP, Alberto Martinez - AM) (20 minutes)**
  - See written report for details!
  - Biggest changes: venue had to be moved for various reasons, but new venue has similar characteristics.
  - Bilingual website is already live - [dh2018.adho.org](http://dh2018.adho.org).
  - Financial questions: the new MOU, indicating ADHO underwriting of conference (including advance of some funds). But procedures for asking and receiving advances are not clear; likewise unclear how the 75/25 split would be handled in practice.
  - Break even point (noted in protocol to be only 250) is moved to 600 but the LOs expect they could host up to 1000 if need be, with 6 simultaneous panels (although up to 8 are physically possible).
  - CC: Thank you for the pre-report. The CCC found the 75/25

stipulation to be clear enough, but recommends that the LOs work directly with JM on this. JM notes that next step is to have a conversation directly with LOs.

- CC notes that the CCC found it very good to have different registration levels based on country incomes. It's been noted, though, that \$50 seemed like not a big difference -- suggest considering an even lower price for delegates from some countries. IG is happy to know this, as long as the budget can balance.
- DJ asks, logistically, whether 6 concurrent sessions means capping the number of acceptances. IG wonders how capping acceptances even works, comparing the total number of attendees is different from number of acceptances (which influences the concurrent session numbers). JG notes that previous PCs have also had to cap the number of acceptances, but increased number of poster acceptances. IG notes that we'll discuss with PC chairs ongoing, as well as figuring out more specifically what the physical limitations are.
- SB: This is the first time we're moving a model in which losses would be assumed by ADHO. Suggests we be more conservative about break even point in consideration of global instability and cost for scholars coming from developing countries: perhaps 500 participants as break even point? Consider working to scale back if needed as registrations come in, or build in cushion by charging higher income categories more.
  - IG: Possibilities for lowering costs include institution covering some fees (e.g., sponsored keynotes); wifi may also be sponsored.
  - EB: Would helpful to have an analysis from 2017 LOs about how many early registrants, etc. Are they members or not? Suggests DH2017 LO share registration typologies with DH2018 as soon as available. JG: when will registration open (so, when does income start coming in)? Would ADHO need to offer a full backstop, e.g. \$56K rather than just the requested \$18K advance, until registration income starts coming in in early 2018? IG notes that they may have some funding available to help make up the difference, or to cover current costs in anticipation of reimbursement. MP: would be possible to open registration earlier, but registration is constrained by the review process.
  - ML supports EB's suggestion for making data on registrant membership status internally available. Additionally suggests



spreadsheet format instead of or in addition to conference report?

- GW: Almost all conference reports have included these numbers, but they are not compiled. GW is happy to help compile with LOs.
- BB asks why do we stick to the old conference calendar, even though DH2018 will be 2 months earlier? KDO notes that the current calendar is the more general, and DH2017 is the exception, so it's okay to stick with the standard calendar.
- OE suggests that there's no need to wait to open registration until acceptances are sent; it might even be advisable to open registration as early as December (e.g., for people to spend end-of-FY funds). JM will discuss with Conftool people the feasibility of opening payment/registration module early; EB notes that LOs can do this themselves!
- IG: How would we know how much to charge in December when we wouldn't know acceptances? Fees dependent on acceptances.
- KDO: Need to end the discussion here because of time constraints.
- FC final question: Figures noted in payment calendar -- are these only preliminary estimates, or are they actual needs? IG: Fee to book venue is due at end of August, which is contributing to the urgency of this particular request.

12.30 Lunch

13.30 [Admissions Committee Report](#) (Ray, 15 minutes)

RS notes that Harold had a last-minute change in schedule, so the reports that RS is giving were composed by Harold. Lots of discussion and lots of desire observed worldwide to join ADHO.

Would like to report informally about discussion about diversity/inclusivity: do those principles represent only Eurocentric or American-centric ideas of diversity?

Regarding admissions and the governance reforms: Admissions Cmte suggests that, pending governance reform implementations, any new COs be admitted provisionally (as usual, following usual patterns). The Cmte will wait to hear from the Implementation Cmte about how this will be affected.

- **Proposals for new Constituent Organizations**

- Digital Humanities Organisation of Southern Africa (DHASA)
  - Admissions Cmte recommends accepting
  - Discussion: LI: What is the thinking behind “Southern” Africa rather than “South Africa”? RS: Early adopters want to go beyond national borders to better reflect existing community. KWa: A number of representatives from Western African nations in attendance? Could EADH-like model be considered for the continent? OE: History of DHASA does include people from other Southern African countries (e.g. Zimbabwe, Mozambique) who have been doing DH for a long time, but it’s hard to find resources in many of those countries. Talking specifically about the lexicography community in Southern Africa, there is a strong tradition of working across national borders. EB notes that in the Leipzig Summer School there have been people from northern African countries, wonders whether there might be encouragement later to expand DHASA to include those?
  - ML supports the idea of having a group like DHASA take a leading role in formation of potentially larger regional organizations, to avoid the possibility of ADHO becoming a large, parliament-like organization with too many single-country delegates. (A similar situation may hold for the Taiwanese proposal.)
  - OE: There is a conference in Nigeria in November following a summer school held in July. Notes difference between EU & African situations -- e.g. no European-style cooperative funding mechanisms in Africa, traveling across continent may be more challenging than in Europe.
  - LI wonders whether this regional vs country-specific emphasis is an issue for ADHO (for both DHASA & TADH): if we admit the organizations as they are, then should a hopeful country (e.g., Mozambique) appear later, what do we tell them?
  - RS: Some of LI’s concerns will be handled by the Implementation Committee. These 2 organizations are electorally represented; and historically, organizations have changed and do continue to change. Thinks this should be an ongoing discussion and negotiation as new countries or organizations make themselves known. LI worries that this could lead ADHO to inadvertently privilege representation of regions based on existing COs. RS finds that the two particular proposals under consideration don’t suffer from

any lingering “colonialism” or poor representativity. MGr notes that all of our organizations can suffer from the same issues! Is supportive of the idea evident in these proposals that they are grass-roots organizations, as they should be.

- Taiwanese Association for Digital Humanities (TADH)
  - Admissions Cmte recommends accepting
  - TT has been following the development of TADH & has attended their conferences. Their development is steady & membership base is strong. TT strongly supports admission of TADH.
  - LI agrees that this seems like a very strong organization, but notes the growing interest in Chinese DH in particular. (See earlier publication report discussion.) Do the very complicated geopolitical circumstances there lead to a risk of Chinese scholars being excluded or suffering because of ADHO’s decision? Wants to be very wary and conscientious of ADHO’s decisions leading to unexpected consequences.
  - CS: By accepting TADH, we are not in any way accepting Taiwan as an independent political entity.
  - OE: Notes an analogous situation in Norway some years back, where Chinese delegates did not attend a meeting of an international committee out of protest for the recent Nobel Prize. If Chinese make the decision not to attend for whatever reason, then that’s their decision, and ADHO does not need to be responsible for that decision.
  - CS: Conversely, a prospective Chinese DH organization would probably not be able to carry out representation of Taiwanese scholars.
  - KDO: This might be resolved in a general way by announcing very plainly (i.e. on our website) what our principles for inclusion in ADHO are: that these are scholarly organizations, not making any political statement.
  - JG: Argues that, since TADH absolutely meets ADHO’s criteria for a CO (e.g., the existence of a governing body, etc.), we are obliged to favor acceptance, rather than trying to account for geopolitical situations beyond anyone’s control.
  - FC: Has one concern about this being a single-nation organization; this logically leads to an inconveniently large number of national organizations. Should we put a limit on the number of COs? If not, the structure of ADHO must change. For example, if a second Italian organization wanted

to organize and become a CO.

- KDO: ADHO's guidelines were changed last year to allow for anyone, regardless of other existing geographically based organizations, to apply to be a CO. (So in the Italian example, a second organization could come into existence and apply separately to ADHO from AUICD.)
- JG: We have a history of overlapping organizations, and it hasn't been a problem. We should continue to abide by our contractual obligations to consider all proposals for membership.
- MGr: It would be interesting to be more proactive in defining our policies. This situation will arise again, e.g., in Latin America, or with a Spanish-language CO.
- KDO: This is something that the Implementation Cmte will discuss. FC notes that it's not only implementation itself, but also actual governance, that is affected by these decisions.
- ML notes that DHASA states explicitly that they are open to including scholars from surrounding nations. But are the scholars from the surrounding nations willing to enter an organization that is born out of a country like South Africa?
- RS: Responds that the Admissions Committee found that DHASA had arisen in this very way: that a nationally focused organization in South Africa became a regionally focused organization because of the simple fact that people from other countries asked to join -- and thus it became organically a regional organization.
- OE notes that future consideration of regional organization, new or change in DHASA, could always occur, just as linguistic and national borders may shift. Cross-border work has been going on for quite a while without leading to disaster.
- KDO asks whether we're ready for a vote, and what the Admissions Cmte has committed to the potential COs. RS clarifies that they have promised only "presentation for a vote" -- which would be the normal route -- but a vote is not the only outcome. Likewise, the normal route would be that we would vote to allow a CO in an observer status.
- LI asks what the difference between being an observer and full member is? RS describes process with Humanistica, in which they have been an observer over 2016-17 and are moving forward with full membership in the coming year. If a concern is raised during the observing period, then that

- could be considered by the SC.
  - OE clarifies that the coming vote would move one or both organizations into an observer organization for the next year. A representative from the accepted organization(s) would be invited to the Tuesday meeting.
  - **BB: Motion made (and seconded) to accept admission of DHASA into observer status; OE seconds. Passed unanimously.**
  - **TT: Motion to accept admission of TADH into observer status. MGr & KWa second. Passed unanimously.**
  - RS will convey the good news to delegates of both newly accepted COs, and will invite them to Tuesday's meetings as observers.
- SIG Proposal:
  - Digital Literary Stylistics:
    - Already meeting around conference, and acting very much like a SIG
    - Admissions Cmte recommends accepting
    - **KWa moves that the DLS SIG be accepted as an ADHO SIG. SB seconds. Passes unanimously.**
- BB asks for clarification on the concept of "diversity" as it applies across organizations, and to new organizations. Should we codify what it really means for us? KDO suggests that this question be moved to the committee examining the Code of Conduct revisions. SB asks that Admissions do include more specific information about diversity issues in their next report.

13.45 Various proposals (60 minutes)

- **Support of Humanistica journal *Humanités numériques*** (MGr, see <http://www.humanisti.ca/revue>)
  - MGr: Humanistica asks for support and integration of the journal into the ADHO publishing ecosystem. This was done quite informally because of the need to launch the journal and the absence of a precise protocol on ADHO's side.
  - KDO notes that other journal issues have been discussed this morning; asks how detailed we have been to date in this conversation of *Humanités numériques*?
  - GW notes we have taken informal steps to integrate (e.g., added a representative - Aurélien Berra - to the Publications Committee) but not discussed financial support. JM: How time-sensitive is resolving financial support? CC: The call deadline for first two

issues is in December; therefore, first issue should be out in later 2018 at earliest.

- JM: Based on earlier discussions, the relationship of ADHO finances and CO publications should be a major topic for the Implementation Cmte (esp. given the history of ADHO organization and finances as centered primarily around publications).  
Recommends at least considering a one-year offer of financial support for the Humanistica journal, then certainly keep them in mind during the Implementation Cmte work for ongoing support (since it's not clear that ADHO will continue to support publications centrally).
- ML notes that there is a growing number of journals, but ADHO already has 2 journals as "its formal voice". What happens if other regional organizations also ask for funding? It's not just a matter of giving funds to a scientific initiative; it's a matter of deciding that "the voice of ADHO" in digital humanities is expressed only in existing journals, or whether we want to have many voices that express what DH is. Should we decide which voices we support?
- BB: DH will express itself in many languages, no matter what we decide. MGr agrees that this is not so much a decision of the SC, but rather a natural situation. He recalls that Humanistica is not a future partner but is formally a CO. BB notes that, since Humanistica is already part of the ADHO ecosystem, we are obliged to support it -- but we should clarify the nature and duration of that support.
- JG: ACH is encouraging new voices coming from across the field. DHQ is at capacity for accepting and publishing articles. ACH would like to see more voices coming to the fore. Is conscious that DHQ is a budget line for ADHO, and there's concern that it might be taking away support for newer forms of publication. Is also aware that to compensate, ACH may need to take on more responsibility for DHQ.
- KDO: from the discussion, it's clear that the SC's position is not yet clear! To accommodate more new journals, we'll have to clarify all of this at the Implementation Cmte.
- KWa proposes motion (as JM offered earlier): that ADHO provide a one-year grant to Humanistica in support. EB seconds; discussion continues. LI: Can we be more specific about how the money would be used? MGr: Purpose in coming to ADHO was to see what's possible, rather than just ask for a particular grant (producing a precise demand would have been possible, if requested); what is needed for getting the journal off the ground?

KDO notes that we might combine the “goodwill disbursement” to Humanistica as a new CO with the proposal to financially support the journal.

- CS suggests assessing need by asking for a more formal proposal.
- CS: in response to question about how to integrate the journal into the landscape: we should talk about sharing journal metadata.
- EB: EADH has created a forum of AOs precisely to discuss what the funding would support. EADH allows the AOs to use funding to build up journal or do whatever they feel necessary, instead of coming to EADH for specific needs of individual journals.
- BB notes that people may not want to publish in certain places based on journal impact factor. Is there a way we could work toward a multilingual DH journal in which articles are translated? FC notes that existing journals could translate selected articles, or we could establish a multilingual digest of all ADHO publication abstracts. CS: EADH has addressed possibility of multilingual journal, but decided not to pursue it because we have several existing linguistically-based scholarly communities. We came up with the idea for the metadata federation so that metadata could be multilingual as a compromise for assisting scholars finding relevant research, even if entire articles are not translated. OE notes that in communicating with Russian partners that there are many interesting things happening in Russia that we are not aware of, and Russian scholars are limited in participation because of *real* language barriers, e.g., between Western European languages and others.
- KDO suggests we focus for now on the financial question raised by the current topic.
- JG: can we push the charge to the Publications Committee to address? LI notes again that editors on the committee don't feel they are well-placed to decide on accepting a new journal because they are representing only their individual journals. KDO: the financial piece needs to be decided first at the SC level.
- KDO recommends we move to the next proposal. **Outcome: need more formal proposal from Humanistica for financial support of its journal, although the inclusion of a publication subvention in the more general “goodwill distribution” to**

Humanistica could be considered.

- **DH conference abstracts and reviewers data (Christof / ISC)**
  - CS refers us to his written proposal in which 3 different provisions for abstracts, metadata, and reviewer data that can be made available to the community. Notes that the metadata for reviewers involves personally identifying data. We need to decide what kind of data is useful, what kind of data we're allowed to collect and share, and how we should go about getting permission, collecting, and sharing data?
  - Part A makes a proposal for abstracts; Part B notes what needs to be clarified in order to move forward with reviewer data. We cannot do any of this work retrospectively because we need explicit agreement from reviewers & authors for release of metadata. Parts C & D go further.
  - For the reviewers: Suggests the CCC looks into what is possible for collecting & publishing reviewer data. This could take the form of open peer review or anonymous publication of reviews after the fact. This should be opt in or opt out in Conftool: people should not be prevented from reviewing if they choose to opt out.
  - BB: could we add an option in which most vulnerable authors can choose to be reviewed openly only? CS notes complexity of this option. BB highlights vulnerability of certain scholar groups who would benefit from open peer review. CS notes that the proposal doesn't make an explicit recommendation on open peer review on any of these points, but only raises and describes them.
  - CS has noted in the proposal who would be responsible for making specific recommendations.
  - FC expresses reservation about making metadata public in the future. Also concerned about making some reviews open and some not. This would radically change the nature of the entire reviewing process. Also suspects that we can now simply use anonymized data from ConfTool. CS notes that anonymization becomes very difficult the richer the metadata is.
  - Proposal is only that the CCC will be charged with looking into which data is useful and legal to collect and publish: it's a roadmap for addressing the problem more than a motion to act on it.
  - JG notes that Conftool does not always collect data in useful forms and may or may not be retrievable. (Examples: gender is binary; fields are incomplete.)
  - EB asks what it means to publish data. Many rich possibilities for research contained in all the reviewer data, including full-text



reviews. Still holds out hope for full access to reviewer data. Why should we not be allowed to do this research?

- BB (in response to FC objection to two-type reviewing above) notes that having 2 types of reviews is precisely her point: to highlight problems in the review system.
- KWa notes that passing the question to the CCC is the best idea.
- JG notes that researchers have always wanted even more broad access: e.g., to proposals that weren't accepted! So the issues are many and complicated.
- KDO: Is there anything we can vote on?
- **CS moves we vote on the proposal as a whole as a roadmap for moving forward. GW & EB second. Passes unanimously.**

14.45 Short break

15:00 Conference bids DH2020 (90 minutes)

- 15:00 Ottawa
- 15:30 Pittsburgh
- 16:00 Discussion (*confidential*) & decision
  - **Votes in favor of Ottawa**

16.45 Committee reports & discussion (Part 2: 5 minutes each)

- [Next steps with regard to the DH Convalidator](#) for DH conference abstract submissions (Christof / ISC)
  - CS notes the Convalidator has been successfully used in previous conferences including in Krakow & a number of German conferences. LOs in Montreal chose not to use Convalidator (which CS finds unfortunate). CS has been gathering feedback on ways to make Convalidator a more accommodating platform. The main issue is that input into Convalidator (which uses a word-processor template) will always be inconsistent because it's not possible to force everyone to use the template in a consistent way. Consequently, the Convalidator gets many different kinds of input, so it's difficult to create valid TEI XML. The Krakow LOs therefore spent a lot of time normalizing. Initial idea was to encourage LOs to use -- and then to invest in *improving* it -- but that has not quite gone according to plan, thus CS believes it falls to the SC to invest in further development, leading to this proposal.
  - There is a Convalidator issue tracker on Github where discussion has been taking place. Hoping to use these discussions to improve Convalidator so that it can put out valid TEI XML. The parser platform that Convalidator uses is Oxgarage, which, however, is not well maintained. The proposal includes creating a replacement

platform for Oxgarage that Convalidator might use. There is an existing conversion tool for TEI to PDF for creating book of abstracts. CS proposes implementing the transformation to TEI ourselves.

- CS notes that in 2016 there was a subvention of 2K Euros requested which was never codified, and thus never used; he proposes that we confirm this subvention, and supplement it.
- GW notes that the 2016 SC meeting minutes are somewhat incomplete regarding the DH2016 LOs' actual (and largely positive) experience with Convalidator, and it's possible that this led the DH2017 LOs not to adopt the tool. To correct the record of this for future LOs, GW will append more detailed clarifications that were received later from the 2016 LOs.
- CS notes that this proposal is closely related to his previous one: to produce a TEI XML version of the book of abstracts; the Convalidator would enable this (and CS fears that the current conference may not produce such, which could leave a gap in the record).
- Also in touch with DH Abstract initiative, which has put together abstracts 1997-2003 and would like to expand their work.
- FC comments on some concerns already expressed by the DH2019 LOs, and that the use of open templates in Word will always mean that manual translation to XML will always need to be done after the fact. If it's possible to enforce use of styles in a particular language or platform, then the Word template may work better. Alternatively, is there a more lightweight markup language than TEI?
- CS notes that other markup languages have been considered, e.g. LaTeX, but this markup language is far less common in our community. Another option (the forms-based DH Writer) was tried in Lausanne, but its development has not been followed up, and it would require even much more work.
- EB notes that problems using Convalidator for a large conference are reflected not in the platform but in the community and its reluctance to follow rules, etc. The idea of having a TEI output from a Convalidator is a good initiative for our community for not only archiving but also visualization, building networks. EB proposes joining forces with others in the community (e.g., Toma Tasovac) who are working on very similar efforts.
- JG notes that LOs have a lot of work on their plate, and they don't want to work on the abstracts because of their workload. Have we reached a point at which we need a multiyear position whose

responsibility is to make sure outputs are valid, and that the community's records are kept safe and consistent? Do we need an archivist? This might give us consistency in the abstracts who could work with Christof and Ian and receive professional credit for doing this. A named position, something like a "Conference Data Curator."

- BB asks if this would need to be a paid position.
  - OE reminds that this Convalidator discussion began with wanting to cut costs when creating a book of abstracts. The cost of producing the book of abstracts has always been high, and ADHO (and/or LOs) have always had to bear it; If ADHO becomes more deeply involved in conference planning, then this should be an easier task to do.
  - SB states that book of abstracts format should be a requirement for LOs who are accepted to host a conference. The platform then needs to be good enough for them to use. It's disappointing that the abstracts are not in XML this year. Having one person who can carry the cultural memory forward (and relieving the LOs of this burden) is a great idea.
  - KWa adds that TEI is not the only issue, but that the Convalidator has trouble with images. As visualization becomes part of more proposals, this issue will only be magnified. CS notes that some issues with presentation of images are indeed addressed in his proposal.
  - SB suggests that now is the best time to come up with a firm policy; that ADHO & LOs have mutual interest.
  - JG notes importance of meeting expectations of our community regarding our scholarly output.
  - CS notes that curating abstract data falls between the CCC, Infrastructure, and Publications committees. CS notes that we've already voted on a mandate in conference guidelines that abstracts be published in a semi-structured format like TEI XML.
  - KWa moves that both the money already allocated for Convalidator (2K Euros), and an additional 2K Euros for further development, be approved. Seconded and approved unanimously.
- [Conference Coordinating Committee](#) (Claire Clivaz)
    - CC notes that the current guidelines are too detailed and that ADHO needs a simpler more flexible set of guidelines. An ad hoc committee has been formed that includes Brian Croxall (chair), Glen Worthey, Susan Schreibman, and Deb Verhoeven to improve (consolidate, simplify, etc.) the conference guidelines.

- CC will step down after DH2018, so keep in mind the need to elect a new CCC Vice-Chair / Chair-Elect.
  
- Awards Committee (KDO)
  - KDO has stepped into interim Chairship; it has taken longer than expected to find a new person, but hopes we will deal with that on Tuesday when we select committee chairs, etc.
  - KWa asks for clarification of what it means for centerNet to “coordinate” this year’s rotation of the Zampolli Prize. Response: it merely means that centerNet’s delegate to the Awards Cmte is responsible to lead the selection for that year.
  - JG notes that Humanistica needs to be added to the rotation. KDO responds that the Awards committee needs to address this and develop a proposal.
  
- Infrastructure Committee (CS)
  - CS highlights that ISC acted on the decision to set up MediaWiki and have started the migration process, though it’s been a bit slow. He notes that the slowness is not a major problem; people and organizations can migrate at their own pace.
  - A major issue with adho.org: the domain registration had still been owned personally by John Unsworth (!), and the process of re-registering went much less smoothly than anticipated; the ISC has learned something! (CS notes that a similar issue will occur with EADH, whose eadh.net is personally owned by Melissa Terras, but is hopeful that the experience with adho.org will make that transition smoother.)
  - The biggest task was work on a membership management system, specifically, undertaking preparatory investigations. This has been under discussion for a number of years predating CS’s involvement. Has developed a plan to move forward using the Drupal plugin CiviCRM. The German EADH AO (DHd) has agreed to be the guinea pig for this system, and has contracted a company to help with that setup -- which was very high, at € 10k-12k just for one organization; thus DHd has declined to respond positively to this proposal due to its expense, and thus the effort has stalled so far. The system is definitely in line with our values, is open source, etc. -- but is not trivial to set up, and not something that we should just do on our own. Professional support is required to manage sensitive data and payments.
  - Other activities of the ISC not quite as significant; the budget

request is standard and in line with previous years -- with one exception: ISC proposes that if a CO or AO desires to invest in a membership system on its own, that ADHO support that effort financially (and in collaboration with Ian Rifkin), so as to reap the advantage of experience for the whole community.

- CS notes that individual sign up pages for individual associations in different languages (and under different legal regimes) adds complexity to the membership system. If all data is entirely in one system, data would need to be compartmentalized to account for following privacy laws across organizations. A separate CiviCRM installation (MySQL database) for each organization would therefore be needed. The plugin will make tracking membership data easier, but it will not be possible to generate a single spreadsheet. OE notes that, as of a few months ago, it is legal to store European data abroad, but only if the contractor guarantees data security. So it is possible, but not at all easy! Still, strongly concurs with CS's opinion on its difficulty and importance.
- CS responds that CiviCRM is our best option because there is no fee associated with accessing the tool itself, though each installation will come with its own set up & management costs. 10K Euros per separate Drupal installation (including training). Initial plan was to set up a trial instance first, then move gradually -- but no longer feels confident enough to make a motion that we should invest 60k-80k Euros up front.
- MGo has used CiviCRM for a different scholarly society, offers to share his experience with CS.
- KDO proposes that we return to this discussion and SIG, Membership reports on Tuesday after CS & MGo have had a chance to discuss. JM will incorporate the ISC budget request into his budget for Tuesday, and we can vote on the budget as a whole.

**17.30 Adjourn**

**18.00 ADHO All-Execs reception: Museum of Fine Arts, 1380 Sherbrooke St W.**

***Continuation: Tuesday, 8 August, 9.00 - 13.00***

**Location: Library Research Commons A, McGill Library (3459 McTavish St.)**

9.00 Coffee and tea

9.30 Introductions and welcome to new attendees

Juan Steyn (DHASA), Muh-Chyun Tang (TADH)

9.35 Committee Reports (5 minutes each)

### Special Interest Groups

- KWe: Currently 4 active SIGs. SIG conveners first met last year, and minutes from this meeting are linked in the report (linked above). Big questions: a high-level picture of role of SIGs in ADHO: how can they participate in program planning, what sort of role can they have in conference planning, etc.?
- Each group was very happy to have time allocated during DH2017 for its members to meet, and KWe will receive reports from the groups after these meetings. Request that the conference CFP include mention of SIGs, as well as SIG topics. This didn't happen for the current year, but hopeful to have this for next year.
- There may be a need to write a charge for the SIG Conveners.
- Can there be a tracking system for SIG topics in conference? More discussion would be helpful.
- SIG conveners would welcome a role in how new SIGs are established as helpful hand, or more meaningful input. Some concern for future that there may be overlaps in SIG themes if the conveners have no role in coordination.
- Not sure what is going on with GO:DH but their meeting notes indicate exploring possibility of becoming a CO. KWe would like to hear more about this because it brings into question roles of SIGs and roles of COs.
- KDO: The Implementation Committee will also address role of SIGs. Please feel free to prompt them during the course of this year.
- Workshop endorsement concept still not very practical, and unclear what the benefits are. This year surfaced some practical questions (like special deadlines, and resulted in extension of deadline for SIG-endorsed workshops). The SIG conveners are meeting Tuesday afternoon at 4pm. Harold & Ray (Admissions Cmte) are invited as well as the new DLS SIG and the (re-emerging) LOD SIG representatives.
- LI notes the desire to revive the dormant Linked Open Data SIG. SB: We had a good LOD in Humanities workshop on Monday. There was strong support for reviving the SIG. KDO has mentioned that we may not need to go through a formal process for restarting the SIG? KWe believes that a low-level formal process may be helpful in reinstating this SIG, even if not required.

- FC asks how SIG tracks in the conference might be formed. KWe notes keywords are already established that may overlap with existing SIG topics. Might it be possible for submitters to choose a SIG track (which would require addition of SIG name/keywords to ConfTool) in addition to selected keywords in ConfTool?
- LI asks if there is SIG representation on PC? FC notes that SIGs are not yet represented; there are already large numbers of people on the Program Committees. JG notes that historically there have always been CO representatives that overlap with SIGs on PC.
- LI notes that if the SIGs proliferate, is there someone with a higher level view of SIG activity. KDO: We'll add this to the list of suggestions for the Implementation Committee.
- SB would like more clarification for a formal process to revive a SIG. KWe feels she is not the person to answer this. KWe will bring up in conveners meeting today, asking Harold and Ray (Admissions Cmte). SB cannot attend but LI can stand in.
- FC notes that that next year may be too early to include SIG representations in the PC/Conference, but offers the possibility of addressing for 2019. JG notes that draft CFP for 2018 was just made yesterday and is still open to discussion, so SIG track could be considered for addition. ML notes that year after year there are more scheduling conflicts, and yet the SIG interests are increasingly relevant. Could SIGs be asked to manage some content of the conference somehow? This could be a way to obtain continuous involvement from SIGs? FC notes that SIGs topics do not cover the entire complexity of the conference topics, so their involvement could lead to uneven topic coverage. JG notes that we would need to adjust the conference protocol to create subcommittees of the PC to handle workshops, tracks, etc.
- ML notes that it may be good for those competent in particular SIG areas to be called upon to review conference proposals. KWe agrees and notes that SIGs actively recruit their members to review abstracts.

### Membership Committee

- FC notes that the membership numbers are not firm because it's so difficult to track membership using the OUP system, e.g. numbers for AOs are not tracked at all. See report for all the numbers. In sum:
  - There has been a small increase in overall membership since June and December. We can see that there is a small decrease in membership of "traditional" COs; last year was not like this, so it may not be a trend. Overall numbers are stable thanks to Humanistica, whose members were added mid-year. Note (on the graphs in FC's written report) that Germany has the biggest

- association of DH in the entire world.
- France, US, Italy, and Canada follow. The numbers of the Canadian association may appear lower because a large number of Canadians are members of Humanistica.
- Issues are always the same: the membership management system. Whoever takes over for FC in this role would be grateful if we resolved this!
- There is also an issue with managing flow of membership income. Keeping track of the membership numbers is important, e.g., for elections. The counts are taken at different points in time, leading to some members not being able to vote depending on when they were counted. There was an issue with the election this past year in EADH because not everyone who joined was able to vote due to trouble integrating new members with the voting system. This situation will likely get worse as more COs (and more complexly-constituted COs) join ADHO.
- The organization of the membership committee has been difficult: FC started an actual committee (consisting of the membership officers of all the COs), but for various reasons, people didn't participate. Not clear why this didn't work, but FC still believes that an actual membership committee would be helpful -- so whoever takes up this position is advised to pursue that, not only to track and advise on high-level membership matters, but also to help in tracking problems with membership.
- KWa has noted trouble tracking membership of centerNet, for example. centerNet manages membership internally, so there is some communication that must be done between OUP system & centerNet to combine numbers for reporting.
- KWa notes other communication problems with OUP in some areas, e.g. enabling developing-nation subscription fees.
- COs may need to take more prominent role in tracking their own membership, e.g. as ACH has done this by adding a webpage that explains what it means to be a member and how to become a member.
- KDO suggests that we may also want to include this issue in the development of the new ADHO website.

10.00 DSH Reports and proposals (Victoria - VS & Øyvind (on behalf of Edward) 15 minutes)

- OE welcomes and thanks Victoria from OUP. Overview: the journal is in a very healthy state in terms of subscriptions, page counts, etc. But there is a growing peer review problem that we need to address.
- VS notes that there is more detail in the written report, that she'll touch on main points.



- 2016 was a good year in terms of traditional subscriptions. Renewal rate for individual subscriptions is 93%, putting subscriptions at 271 in 2017. Numbers are stable: the vast majority of institutional subscribers now take advantage of package deals which include DSH. 2,252 institutional consortia customers through collection deals.
- Breakdown of print vs digital: Just less than half of institutions take print only or print & digital. This is a small portion of overall subscribers, since most institutional subs are online rather than print. Discussion of the financial pros and cons of this small but continuing number of print subscribers.
- Production for 2016-17 has been going OK. Some slight delays in online publication. Target is 4-6 weeks, but currently 7 weeks publication time. This is not an issue for print production, since the copy for print is already ready for advance access of existing articles, but some work needs to be done more on production timeline. The backlog on advance access is fairly stable. Approximately 50 advance access articles available, but still unpublished in print; the backlog goes back to March 2016. The increased page budget recently passed by the SC will decrease that backlog gradually.
- The schedule of issue publication: Issue 2 was slightly behind schedule though still in same month. Generally issues have been published within or near cover months. Page budget slightly over, being actually 916 pp. as compared with the budgeted 912.
- Impact factor and citations: This year, with lingering effects of title change and new ISSN, citations are still split between the two titles. The effect on impact factor (calculated over 2 years) is still visible. 2016-17 impact factors:
  - LLC 1.125
  - DSH 0.589

Normally one expects the older title to have the inflated impact factor. Next year will be first year that DSH receives a complete/full impact factor.

- OUP moved to new web platform, SilverChair for 300+ journals last year; VS is happy with the look of the platform, but there has been a negative impact on usage metrics (thanks to Google re-indexing, etc.).
- In 2016, DSH received roughly same number of full text downloads as 2015, but platform migration and new Google indexing have skewed download numbers for 2017. Now working on new metrics to counteract these effects.
- Marketing: OUP still going to conferences, sending out mailers, but this year there were some new PR efforts, which Edward noted in his report. VS notes that the involvement of editors in PR has been a very positive effect. Edward highlighted a stylometric article on 2016 presidential

primaries by sending out a press release, which was picked up by a number of media outlets. Was a new and successful initiative for journal PR.

- FC asks if online-only subscription can be sold to members? VS notes that it is possible, OUP does already for other journals. Pricing would need to be set for individual online-only access before this could be made possible for DSH. VS estimates that online-only pricing might be about 75 pounds. The balancing point is to make this affordable, but not to undermine income. KDO clarifies whether DSH could become one of these individual online subscriptions; VS says that certainly it could. FC estimates, for example, that 20-30 new subscriptions might be had from AIUCD members alone, if the individual online-only subscriptions were allowed. VS notes that rate would be the same for members and non-members.
- BB recommends (based on personal experience) that we do consider the online-only option.
- KDO asks if ADHO could receive pricing for online-only and to further investigate FC suggestion for AIUCD members.
- OE suggests that we make an inquiry with the Publications Cmte to see whether we have enough information to make a recommendation, and to distinguish the various issues (which KDO believe we may be confusing), which EADH would then pass along to OUP.
- VS reiterates that current print price is 89 pounds and online-only could be 75 pounds (based on other journals that are online-only). OUP will need to balance to be sure no loss of income, though.
- LI notes that in OUP report online downloads are a way to see geographic distribution of readers. Wonders whether it might also be possible to use IP addresses to get finer-grained level of analytics -- at a city level, perhaps, so that we can see where readers are that may be outside of CO regions.
- VS confirms that this information is indeed captured, and OUP will entertain specific queries of this fine-grained data, and offers to facilitate this.
- PA asks whether migration to new platform has affected in any way the membership management? VS confirms that this is a totally separate system.
- KDO thanks VS for her report and for all her work.

10.15 Coffee break (15 minutes)

10.45 Infrastructure Cmte request for to DHd to test the implementation of CiviCRM (continued from Sunday) (Christof)

- CS notes that the largest budget item on the ISC report is payment for

Ian Rifkin's services, which are extremely important, and were indeed needed this past year.

- Server & backup is ~2000 €, CS suggests keeping at 2100 €. We have already discussed Convalidator, but need to return to the membership management system: To give an idea of the costs of this, a thought experiment: what if ADHO were to set up a system/service for everyone (which seems unrealistic, but also unfair to shift all this burden to the COs)? This is the quote received by DHd:
  - 5000 € for CiviCRM installation, including add-ons required for functionality (5 working days at 800 € per day + tax).
  - Includes a training workshop so that ADHO people can become independent users. Could be one time cost if ADHO can build up internal competencies to share across organizations.
  - Also includes support for the first 2 years, both fixing things, updates, and tech support

The total quote is 12,200 €. This is clearly too much for DHd on its own. So what kind of support can ADHO lend to this initiative?

- One resource that we do have is Ian as sys admin and tech support, and if we can rely on him to spend more time on this it would be helpful, but in this case, his budget would have to be increased as well. DHd is also willing to invest time, but we would need to pay anyone they identify as well. Bottom line: The 2,500 € budget request (as noted in the revised budget) for this seems far too low.
- KDO asks whether we could have a good membership system if we could share the costs with DHd?
- CS: If we do this for DHd now, we will be able to have hands-on experience with a new system. From the DHd perspective, this is the best bet. CiviCRM is flexible with a lively development community in English & German with conferences & 8,000+ installations. Much better to have an open-source community like this, rather than relying on a company to do it. As an example, there is a particular extension for CiviCRM that the community built because of recognized need. This is the sort of thing that you could never ask a vendor like Wild Apricot to do.
- SB: Can MGo speak to experience with CiviCRM? Would it be broadly useful across COs & AOs? MGo believes that CiviCRM is an obvious choice given community & functionality. Question about applicability: to what extent and how would it mesh with OUP system?
- MGo has two specific questions regarding the proposal: were there multiple quotes, and would that be desirable? And does the quote include integration with another CMS, e.g. Drupal? CS: Yes, does include Drupal integration, and the experimental DHd install would include full integration.

- CS: For membership data, the model would be that people could choose different membership types on the association website. ADHO (or the COs) would collect money with or without subscriptions and make payments periodically to OUP to give members who also purchase subscriptions access to the journal.
- This is more or less what DHD already does, and it seems to work well: it's a good starting point, and hasn't been disruptive. This would be a further dissociation of membership management from OUP.
- CS adds that there is also a cost for payment processing: monthly or a single charge per payment processed. This is a cost that DHD has been willing to bear.
- JG asks if this experiment is operating in a single currency. Each installation would have to operate within its own currency, with independent bank accounts. Then COs would become responsible for transferring payments to OUP. That creates a lag for transferring subscriptions. OUP has not always been responsive or quick in sharing information. JG sees that lag could be up to 2 months for new subscriber payment to move from CO to OUP, and this could be effected by changing currency rates. CS confirms that this is the case.
- OE reports conversation with Victoria of OUP in which she believes that each external system could be set up such that a list of subscribers could be sent to OUP and activated regularly, e.g. weekly, and payment could be made only once-twice per year (desirable for many reasons, but perhaps subject to currency fluctuations, etc.). In sum, OUP is very flexible about this.
- CS notes that the system can generate report that gives names, addresses of new subscribers, which could be sent easily to OUP. Then COs could know membership numbers day-to-day rather than requesting from OUP and needing to wait for response. Elections, member management, etc. will be much easier with individual systems. There will still be separate systems, meaning sharing will still be important, but format will be same across systems, so data can be easily aggregated.
- FC asks about the quote: € 5K to set up the whole system, including bank account, etc.? Seems a little costly. CS is not sure about connecting to a bank account directly, but otherwise € 5K covers the entire installation.
- FC asks whether developers could give a better offer for an installation of 6-7 systems? (FC has installed already CiviCRM for AIUCD, but hasn't used it; is willing to participate in the experiment.)
- CS agrees that we may be able to talk down the 5K quote. But as for future, they don't expect the payment to be at this level for every new installation, and they do expect a drop in fees every year; also, no need

for a new training workshop every year. But doesn't think it's a good idea to try to get a deal for 5 yrs from the start: unclear how much the savings would actually be, also unclear whether we should commit already. Still recommends starting slowly.

- KWA asks if that means every CO will need Drupal? CS: CiviCRM was developed for Drupal, which is recommended, but is not necessarily bound to Drupal. It does mean that we'll have more Drupal installations, which is contrary to what we decided a few years ago. On the positive side of this proliferation, if one site is compromised, the others will not be.
- FC asks if CS has calculated costs for infrastructure for power & storage? This will de facto change the financial model (and money flow) of ADHO, at least for membership money. JG notes that change in flow of money was already decided in 2016. FC notes that this will still require a whole set of new procedures, even though agrees that this is in accordance with what has been decided.
- CS notes that system will facilitate bank transfers because we'll know at any given time the exact number of new members. The idea is to empower COs to take membership into their own hands, which means they'll have to do the calculation themselves.
- PA asks why it's impossible to have one single system. CS: 2 reasons: complexity of managing many currencies, and many different payment processors. But another big reason is question of data privacy legal requirements in Europe, so the financial data would have to be strictly compartmentalized, which is not possible in a single system.
- FC notes that data sharing is currently happening because OUP sends a single spreadsheet with all memberships, regardless of association. Whoever sees the spreadsheet has access to all of the data currently.
- OE notes that multiple currency problem is already in place e.g. in Nordic countries, so sees it as a good thing to stick with a single currency for the trial. CS responds that multiple currencies are not impossible to handle, but having many currencies with multiple payment processes is more a challenge than having 2 payment processes with currencies spread out across individual systems.
- MGo: 2 attractions to this shift: possibility of scaling, and dissociation of membership functions from OUP (which has long been a desire). But how would this work when people register for multiple associations? CS: this is indeed a question. His first idea is that each CO have a membership category for the low-price "additional/add-on" membership -- so that people would simply join the additional CO separately. (FC clarifies that additional membership would need to cost a small amount, CS agrees, that it would be just the amount needed by ADHO.)

- ML asks about scalability of the system. For associations with multiple associates, the cost may become very high. After 2 or 5 years, what will be the continuing cost of running the system? What will be cost for infrastructure and for personnel? Multiple people will need to be trained and able to work for free, or we'll need to pay them. CS: acknowledges that free software doesn't mean free maintenance: there are always costs in currency processing, tech support, updates, etc. But sees it as a few additional hours of work similar to Ian's current work. There is a running cost, but expects it to be relatively low: commercial costs will start high and diminish with time.
- ML asks whether this estimate is not scaled per association? So larger associations will support cost better than smaller associations? CS believes that this doesn't actually make sense for smaller AOs. (Even though this will lead to different approaches to membership management across ADHO.)
- KWa notes that centerNet does not have privacy issues because their members are organizations rather than individuals. Would also like to see a list from ADHO of what membership information ADHO needs so that this can be gathered with or without CiviCRM. CS Yes, reporting would need to be standardized across the COs/AOs.
- KWa: Are we paying OUP for membership management now? KDO notes that we do not pay OUP explicitly for membership management. JGu clarifies: Actually, we do pay for extra projects, e.g., to set up an additional election. CS notes that membership management is done as part of OUP package.
- KDO notes that it would take years before OUP's system could accommodate ADHO's needs.
- CS notes that OUP may be unlikely willing to lower their percentage if they view the current system as being adequate. So there are no actual savings from our taking over this function from them.
- ML notes that management system is a question of offering support to smaller associations.
- KDO asks for decision making: can we settle on at least some things? Can we agree just that CiviCRM is the way to go?
- MGo wonders how much discussion has already taken place.
- FC is concerned about multiple installations. Cost will be higher in the beginning, but it may cost less for organizations in the long term. We'll have a heterogenous system of some organizations using only spreadsheets; others using CiviCRM, others using some additional system. SB agrees with FC: that the heterogeneity / disparity that will result, serving only a few CO/AOs, is a strong negative. We shouldn't have to subsidize in personal labor what other orgs need to set up this

system.

- JG notes that each CO would be committing 10% (12000 €) to install and get new system running. This is a major investment for something that will not benefit everyone. It will penalize smaller COs who don't have the resources to run an independent system.
- OE notes that some organizations, e.g. in Russia, will not be able to use an international system such as CiviCRM administered by ADHO for legal reasons in specific nations. FC agrees, and further: these can't even use the OUP system. CS responds that individual organizations could install their own local versions of CiviCRM and manage locally to address legal issues.
- KWa: we should go back to our actual reporting needs, and see whether we can find a solution. CS notes that he and Chris Meister talked to a number of people about membership needs and gathered a lot of information. KWa clarifies that we have already done this -- but have never determined what specific membership reporting functions we actually need, from a higher level.
- KDO asks to clarify: ADHO would create a description of membership information needs and what ADHO can offer, and COs would provide that information while choosing whether to take advantage of what ADHO offers. CS: the idea was that ADHO would provide as a generic service available for all to implement on their own. But what is not possible is for ADHO to provide the customized system for all the COs.
- KDO: the next question is that for those COs who already have to look for something else, they may be even less willing to contribute to ADHO-wide system in future? CS: Proposes that we encourage DHd to go ahead and use the system, and report to us their experience in a year. Realizes that the 50% level might be more than SC is willing to support, but would like to come to some agreement on what it's worth to ADHO to have the results of the experiment for itself.
- JG asks why request is not going to EADH directly rather than to ADHO, as EADH has direct connection to DHd? CS sees the point, and perhaps DHd should request support from EADH -- but notes that the initial desire to find a solution comes from ADHO. So supporting DHd to make a first step does indeed support the general ADHO requirement. CS is pretty confident that if we don't help DHd, they won't do it, and then ADHO won't have the experience to draw on. (OE further notes that DHd could then be seen as subsidizing ADHO by trying the system first.)
- MGo: the reason for ADHO to support this is its scalability. It's clear that the unified system is impossible, and that the implementation will be uneven. It's an experiment, but a costly one with uncertain results. CS notes that the plan is to scale, moving from one association to multiple.

We have realized that it may not be cost effective for every organization, however. Might be able to investigate supporting installation in 2-3 smaller AOs.

- FC asks if CiviCRM could first be implemented in EADH AOs (EADH, DHd, AUICD et al.) to see how system scales? Notes that it must be possible to limit data sharing across these organizations.
- KDO would like to move toward agreement of an amount of money that ADHO is willing to spend for this experiment.
- CS notes that DHd's experiment would scale up to EADH first, but needs to discuss details with EB. The experiment should not go to 3-4 AOs at the same time: that makes the experiment just too big. FC notes that if the first step is too small, the next step would simply be more costly.
- KWa notes that we have not explored what Ian might be able to contribute. KDO: Ian would need more time and more money as well.
- KDO summarizes: about 12K € is required for DHd to take this first step. The 2500 € initial proposal from ADHO would not be enough. Would 4000 € be enough? CS: If ADHO puts in 4K € (i.e.,  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the cost) then he believes that DHd would do it.
- KDO: Is this a proposal we can vote on now? Otherwise, we'll need to negotiate further on paper. Suggests a private vote.
- JG counter proposal: given the freshness of the budget numbers, might we delay the vote to later, over email, in order to look more closely.
- KDO agrees with JG proposal, noting that vote may be pushed to September to accommodate holidays. It's important that everyone knows what we are talking about and is well informed enough to make a vote.
- GW notes that this discussion has been had extensively in past years, though agrees that it's important to consider in relation to updated budget. The 4000 € is small in relation to ADHO budget, as opposed to individual organization budget.
- OE reminds us of the years of frustration with the OUP membership system, and if we don't resolve it, we're stuck with that system again.
- SB speaks in favor of voting today, in favor of allocating 4000 € to the test system with DHd, with the understanding that ADHO will be willing in future to invest in smaller organization installations in future if needed. This is an experiment that ADHO will undertake to see how well it could scale up. If this does not work, then the Infrastructure Committee would look at additional possibilities for those individual organizations which are constrained by national laws.
- Motion: that we allocate 4000 € for the CiviCRM installation by DHd, with the clarification that it is indeed an experiment meant to benefit all of ADHO. KWa seconds. Passes unanimously.



11.40 New committee and officer appointments (60 minutes)

(Discussion confidential)

Candidates: [http://bit.ly/ADHO\\_Nominations\\_2017](http://bit.ly/ADHO_Nominations_2017)

- Non-voting members / officers of ADHO SC 2016-2017
- Deputy Treasurer
- Secretaries
- Appointment of Committee Chairs
  - Awards
  - Communications
  - Membership
  - Publications
  - Appointment of ADHO Foundation secretary

JGu: Motion to stay the voting for Membership Officer, given single candidate. BB seconds. Passes unanimously.

JGu: Motion to create an ad-hoc Membership Cmte to work for one year. BB seconds. Passes unanimously.

GW & SB: Motion to creation co-chair position for Communications. JGu seconds. Passes unanimously.

11.50 Coffee break (15 minutes)

12:05 Implementation Committee (Jen, 15 minutes)

- JGu: The Implementation Cmte (JG, Geoffrey Rockwell, Christian-Emil Ore, Melissa Terras) met Monday morning w/ KDO and GW. She conveys committee's appreciation to the SC in advance.
- The Cmte will be meeting 2x each month and may be asking throughout the year for CO representatives to provide information directly in response to questions.
- Cmte will be asking KDO to ask SIGs, in particular, as well as COs to provide a list of questions or issues that need to be addressed in new implementation.
- Changes in structure are intertwined with changes in finance. Likely the changes in financial and structural models will need to occur in tandem.
- Cmte will begin majority of work in next 2 weeks and will provide a more detailed plan and timeline to SC soon.

12.20 Resumption of unfinished topics, or last-minute topics (if any)

- KWa: Do we need to select a new Foundation Secretary? KDO: Let's wait and discuss with the two new Secretaries to decide.

- HJ: A small group met to discuss a new multilingual ADHO website, with a complex task of site redesign, migration to Drupal 8, internationalization, and multilingualism. **The COs and AOs will be asked for a liaison from these language communities to help with translation.** Additionally, a new space on the website was proposed for non-CO members of the CO family, including AOs and SIGs.

Review of financial impact of decisions made, and adjustments as needed (20 minutes)

See [\*Revised budget spreadsheet\*](#) (current as of 7 August, assuming passage of all proposed expenditures)

- Humanistica “goodwill” disbursement (3,000 €) and journal seed grant (1,500 €)

**GW moves that ADHO authorize a seed grant to Humanistica (and its journal) for 3,000 €. KWa seconds. Passes unanimously.**

- Infrastructure budget requests (Christof)
  - 3,960 € for work on DHConvalidator

**GW moves that ADHO authorize 3,960 € for work on DHConvalidator. EB seconds. Passes.**

- Indication of ADHO’s ability and intention to provide 15,541 € to DH2018 LOs as an advance toward conference costs (coming from budget reserves)

**Already approved; does not require vote.**

13.00 Adjourn