

Minutes: 2018 Steering Committee (Mexico City)

ADHO Steering Committee 2018

Minutes of 2018 SC Meetings

Originally compiled by Brian Croxall and Maciej Eder, ADHO Secretariat, and Sara Sikes, ADHO Treasurer. Edited by ADHO Secretariat.

Voting representatives of Constituent Organizations

- aaDH, 1 vote: Hugh Craig
- ACH, 2 votes: Jennifer Guiliano, Matthew K. Gold
- centerNet, 1 vote: Paul Arthur
- CSDH/SCHN, 1 vote: Susan Brown
- EADH, 3 votes: Barbara Bordalejo, Elisabeth Burr, Øyvind Eide
- Humanistica, 1 vote: Clarisse Bardiot
- JADH, 1 vote: Tomoji Tabata
- DHASA, 1 vote: Juan Steyn (after motion)
- TADH, 1 vote: Jieh Hsiang (after motion)

Expected attendance: officers, committee chairs, CO representatives (and identifying initials for these minutes)

- Chair: Karina van Dalen-Oskam - **KDO**
- Secretaries: Brian Croxall - **BC**, Maciej Eder - **ME**
- Treasurers: Jarom McDonald - **JM** (Sunday only)
- Deputy Treasurer: Sara Sikes - **SS**
- Admissions Cmte Chair: Harold Short - **HS**
- Awards Cmte Chair (Interim): Karina van Dalen-Oskam - **KDO**
- CCC Vice Chair: Diane Jakacki - **DJ**
- Implementation Cmte Chair: Geoffrey Rockwell - **GR** (Sunday only)
- Infrastructure Chair: Christof Schöch - **CS**
- Ad-hoc Membership Committee: Fabio Ciotti - **FC**
- MLMC Chair: Maurizio Lana - **ML**
- Publications Cmte Chair: Ashley Sanders Garcia - **ASG** (Tuesday only)
- SIG Liaison: Zoe Borovsky - **ZB**
- aaDH rep: Hugh Craig - **HC**
- ACH reps: Jen Guiliano - **JG**, Matt Gold - **MG**
- centerNet reps: Paul Arthur - **PA**, Laura Mandell - **LM**
- CSDH/SCHN rep: Susan Brown - **SB**
- EADH rep: Barbara Bordalejo - **BB**, Elisabeth Burr - **EB**, Øyvind Eide - **OE**

- Humanistica rep: Clarisse Bardiot - **CB**
- JADH rep: Tomoji Tabata - **TT**
- DHASA rep: Juan Steyn - **JS**
- TADH rep: Jieh Hsiang - **JH** (Tuesday only)

List of Decisions and Motions passed

Admissions

- DHASA and TADH confirmed as full COs
- RedHD will be admitted as a CO on 1 January 2019.
- Motion approved to accept a Pedagogy and Training SIG.

Governance

- Motion approved to accept voting for CO admission via email until the new governance transition takes place.
- Motion approved to vote on the Minimum Service Fee (MSF) proposal.
- Motion approved to adopt the MSF model.

Finances

- Motion approved to have treasurers prepare a budget that considers all requests from COs and other bodies. Treasurers should send out notification for budget requests to all concerned parties

Appointments

- Diane Jakacki appointed chair of CCC
- Matt Gold appointed chair of the ad-hoc membership group
- Micki Kaufman appointed chair of Awards Committee
- Brian Croxall and Maciej Eder again appointed as ADHO Secretariat
- Sara Sikes appointed ADHO treasurer and Jarom McDonald made deputy treasurer

List of Action Items

Items for the Steering Committee

- Incorporate ADHO code of conduct into governance changes
- Inclusion of protocols for making email decisions within the governance documents
- Consider shifting the fiscal year with the governance changes to the calendar year

Items for ADHO Committees

Awards

- Consider how the Lisa Lena Opan-Hänninen prize could be reimagined

CCC

- re-consider the 3-year conference rotation and the consequences of both keeping the current model and changing to a new model
- consider how to encourage bidders to address the Conference Code of Conduct
- coordinate the handoff of ConfTool from one set of PC chairs and LOs

Publications

- Publications committee should discuss whether to rename / reconceive the “Book of Abstracts” with the goal of making it more visible. They will also consider issues such as minting DOIs, archiving. They should involve someone from the Libraries and DH SIG in these discussions as well as Edward Vanhoutte.
- ASG will check with Edward to see how much an additional 200 *DSH* pages would cost

Items for ADHO Officers

- SC Chair to write to Kathy Weiner to thank her for her work as SIG liaison
- Secretariat will convey appreciation of SC to Claire for her work of 3 years on CCC
- SC chair and Secretariat prepare a summary of the discussion about makeup of COB
- Secretariat will contact the new appointments to let them know of their appointments.
- Treasurers should implement a calendar for receiving budget requests prior to each year’s SC meeting.

Items for COs

- MG, LM, and CS will discuss trial installs of CiviCRM for ACH and centerNet
- CSDH/SCHN will appoint a new individual to CCC
- Each CO provides names of those serving on DH2020 PC as soon as possible to PC co-chairs.

Items for individuals on the SC

- SS, JM, SB, HS, and JS will form a task force to fill in the details about the newly adopted MSF model and will report by Friday, 29 June when they will have their report ready
- OE to discuss with DSH editorial team the idea of including DH conference presenters and reviewers in the reviewing pool

Sunday, 24 June, 9.00-17.30

Location: Sheraton Mexico City Maria Isabel Hotel, Constitución A

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Karina van Dalen-Oskam (President), Maciej Eder (Secretary), Jarom McDonald (Treasurer)

9.00 Coffee and greetings

9.30 Welcome (KDO, 10 minutes)

- Welcome by ADHO Chair (KDO)
- Roll call of attendees
- [Motion](#) to confirm DHASA and TADH as full COs
- See reports of [DHASA](#) and [TADH](#) annual activities

Following introductions, KDO began the meeting. HS reminded everyone of the process for admitting DHASA and TADH that was agreed on in Montreal at the 2017 SC meeting. In short, a delay was introduced insofar as it was anticipated that the governance transition would take place by the 2018 conference. Since that is not happening, the Admissions Committee felt it was important to present DHASA and TADH for full membership in ADHO and give them a vote immediately.

The motion to confirm DHASA and TADH was presented, seconded, and approved (10-0, in favor).

9.40 Chair's report (KDO) (20 minutes)

Please see the [Chair's](#) report among the Meeting Documents

KDO indicated that the ADHO Conference Code of Conduct would be important to emphasize again at this year's conference. She is also thinking about making a statement about how conference participants might effectively use social media to communicate what is happening at the conference.

At the Montreal meeting in 2017, it was decided that ADHO should adopt a Code of Conduct that is broader than just the Conference Code of Conduct. KDO suggests that such a Code should be included in the governance changes.

Finally, KDO discussed the governance changes. As the Officers previously communicated, the transition has been postponed until 1 January 2019. There is still much work to do, however, and should the SC be unable to finish the changes during the conference and during Fall 2018, we might have to extend the transition until the conference in Utrecht.

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

Please see [Treasurer's report](#) and [budget](#) on the Meeting Documents page.

The Treasurers presented their report and the budget for 2018. The numbers they presented were tentative for two reasons. First, the SC could make decisions during the meeting that had financial repercussions and would therefore affect disbursements to COs. Second, since the conference was held earlier this year, OUP wasn't completely ready with the geographic breakdown.

The income generated by *DSH* in 2017 was 136k GBP. Institutional subscriptions continue to account for 80-85% of the journal's income. After OUP took its costs for producing the journal off the top, the total profit was 117k GBP. After OUP's 30% share of the profits, the income ADHO received in 2018 from the 2017 *DSH* profits was 81,944 GBP.

Despite receiving less in 2017, ADHO's net income remained the same since the number of members-only memberships (e.g., those without a *DSH* subscription) increased. When we started the membership only subscription, we were worried about cannibalizing *DSH* profits. But we hoped that making membership more accessible would lead to more members, and that prediction is now bearing out.

For FY2017 (July 2017 - June 2018), we budgeted to [spend](#) €118k but only spent €111k.

The Treasurers propose to keep the numbers in 2018 roughly in line with 2017. This proposal includes the first disbursements to both DHASA and TADH, which are included in the one-time expenditures budget line. The disbursement model is working well, although it may change with the new governance model. Currently all institutional and consortial funds are assigned to ADHO. Individual and joint memberships are assigned right away to COs based on their proportion of members. Funds disbursed in 2018 are based on 2017 membership numbers.

There are many Affiliate Organizations (AOs) in Europe. EADH forwards €5 for each of the AO members to ADHO to defray infrastructure costs.

JM and SS will switch roles for the coming year, with SS acting as Treasurer and JM as Deputy Treasurer. This role change was planned for in Montreal.

Following a discussion of the budget and how DSH subscriptions and individual membership determine the distribution of votes in the SC, a motion was proposed and approved (11-0) to continue distributing votes among the SC with EADH having three votes; ACH having two votes; and all other COs having one vote. With the upcoming governance change, however, the way voting is determined will shift. The question for that governance change will be how (if at all) a CO can garner more than a single vote.

10.12 Report from Admissions Committee (HS) (30 minutes)

- Discussion of [report from the committee](#)
- RedHD petition to become CO - see [written proposal](#)
- SIGs
- [SIG conveners' report](#)
- Pedagogy and Training SIG proposal - see [written proposal](#)
- SIGs convener transition

Representing the Admissions Committee, HS brought forward the proposal to approve RedHD as a new CO. RedHD, which was established in 2011 has a core membership of 50 individuals and their level of activity is demonstrated by their hosting the conference this year. A vote to approve RedHD as CO would mean that they become a full CO on 1 January 2019.

A discussion about other regional developments in organizations in North, Central, and South America ensued, including the differences between regional-based and language-based COs. JG reminded the SC that the current requirements for becoming a CO are minimal: effectively having a constitution and making application to ADHO.

The motion to admit RedHD as a new CO was presented, seconded, and approved 11-0.

Moving on with the report, HS noted that the Korean DH Association had hoped to apply for CO status in Mexico City, but due to an email going astray the timing was not possible. HS indicates that he hopes the SC will consider their application before the SC meeting in Utrecht. This would mean that they could become a full CO on 1 January 2019, the same as RedHD. HS also reported that an organization in India is considering applying to become a CO.

In response to a question from FC, HS indicated that the Admissions Committee does not formally certify their number of members; HS also noted that the organizations that are applying tend to be well known by someone in the SC meeting, so it would be difficult to apply to become a CO without a real number of members.

ML spoke to the importance of having firm criteria to join ADHO. HS responded that managing these criteria is the job of the Admissions Committee and those criteria are why application to become a CO often takes multiple years.

After the SC discussed what business could be accomplished over email and consulting the ADHO Protocols, SB presented a motion to accept voting for CO admission via email until the new governance transition takes place. The motion was approved 11-0. A request followed to explicitly label emails to make it clear when a vote was underway. OE clarified that in e-voting every voting member needs to participate. The lack of a vote should not be interpreted as an abstention.

10.43 SIG Report (ZB)

ZB presented the SIG report, noting that the SIGs have really appreciated the opportunity to hold face-to-face meetings at the annual conference. SIGs represent an opportunity for members to connect across the different COs, based on research interests.

FC inquired whether SIGs were checking if their members were members of COs. ZB indicated that she was not aware that this was taking place.

A discussion ensued about GO::DH, which in 2017 had expressed an interest in changing its status from a SIG to a CO. ML reminded the SC about the differences between SIGs and COs, such as the latter needing a constitution. BB indicated that GO::DH is still considering its relation to ADHO, and HS seconded by indicating that their primary desire had been to explore the option of becoming a CO. GO::DH was not definite in wanting to pursue that path.

ZB reported that SIGs are interested in the upcoming governance changes and want to have a better sense of how they would be represented following the transition.

HS proposes thanking Kathy Weimer for the work that she has done as SIG Liaison.

HS puts forward the application from the proposed Pedagogy and Training SIG and moves that

they be adopted as a SIG. After seconding, the motion is approved 11-0.

11.00 Short break

11.24 Report from Implementation Committee (GR) (15 minutes)

- [Implementation Committee final report](#)

GR began the discussion by describing how the Implementation Committee (IC) did its work. First they considered what the order of decisions should be. Then they created a road map for their work and shared it on the [IC's website](#). Each document was assigned to an individual to take the lead on drafting it. Drafts were shared and the IC met regularly every two weeks. They had considerable help from KDO, HS, and others. They mostly worked by consensus.

GR indicated that the Preambles, one of which precedes each document, shows what the IC saw as the principles that governed what they had been asked to do. A key concept the IC received from previous governance discussions (in Krakow and elsewhere) was that ADHO was not meant to be representative of all CO members so much as a shared infrastructure body for the COs.

GR thanks those who took the time to read carefully and comment.

GR notes that one recommendation—to merge the president of the Constituent Organization Board (COB) with the chair of the Executive—was not in their mandate. They saw this as necessary given the legal arrangements of Stichting (“Foundation”) ADHO as per Dutch law. KDO indicates that it would be possible to change the legal arrangement of the Foundation and as such it is not necessary to combine the two roles in one person.

Once the SC has made decisions about the transition to the new governance, GR recommends a review of infrastructure and activities, including journals. MOUs should be created between the Foundation and whomever legally represents the organization carrying out each activity. He suggests that all MOUs have a timed review (for example, every 5 years).

GR also notes that the IC recommendations are *not* the final bylaw documents. Someone else would need to be empowered to write them once the decisions had been made as to the new governance structure. He expects that new issues will arise in the drafting of these bylaws.

KDO proposes discussing each of the points raised in the IC documents one at a time and to consider financial scenarios first. The IC [presented](#) two models: the first is to institute a per-member minimal service fee (MSF) that each CO would render to ADHO *if* ADHO's income from institutional subscriptions to *DSH* did not cover its expenses; the second is to keep the current financial distribution model, where ADHO is funded only by institutional subscriptions to *DSH* and disburses surplus monies to COs after paying its expenses. GR explained that one advantage of the MSF model is that it helps create a relationship between the number of members a CO reports that it has (insofar as this governs disbursement of funds) *and* what the CO contributes to the shared ADHO infrastructure.

The SC discussed many aspects of the MSF, including:

- the labor that that model would entail;
- how “minimal” might differ across countries or regions of the world;
- how the MSF would be set and on what frequency;
- whether individuals might choose to join COs based on differential fees (MSF and otherwise);
- the relative merits of adopting a structure that is not needed at the time but may answer funding questions in the future that may arise;
- how to calculate membership given the fluctuations that happen when the conference is in a particular CO's region;
- whether a MSF model served the broad goal of streamlining and simplifying ADHO;
- how scalable the model was to more COs joining ADHO and whether a MSF model would impose fiscal constraints on new COs.

After this initial discussion of financial models, KDO proposed discussing the representative makeup of the COB in the new ADHO governance structure. The IC [proposed](#) three models for COB representation:

1. Each CO gets one vote;
2. Each CO would get two votes, and each Affiliate Organization (AO) and SIG would get one vote;
3. COs would get a number of votes (1-3) based on the number of members that it has

The SC discussed many aspects of these three models, including:

- whether a range representation model (model 3) would lead to COs lowering membership rates with the goal of increasing its number of votes;
- which model could keep the time investment of volunteers to a reasonable level;
- how to best integrate AOs into CO given that some AOs have many more members than some COs.

In these discussions, GR encouraged the SC to remember that all of its members should be understood as acting in good faith and with the purpose of shared infrastructure. GR also indicated that a difficult aspect of completing this work is the ever-changing membership of the SC.

KDO closed the discussion by calling on everyone to thank the IC for their work.

12.30 Lunch

13.14 Governance discussion (60 minutes)

To continue the governance discussion, the SC wanted to consider what it understood ADHO's function to be. To this end, the SC began by consulting the ADHO mission as it appears [on the website](#): "The Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations (ADHO) promotes and supports digital research and teaching across all arts and humanities disciplines, acting as a community-based advisory force, and supporting excellence in research, publication, collaboration and training."

HS reminded the SC that initial discussions about ADHO between John Unsworth and him described ADHO as a "framework for collaboration." OE indicates that insofar as ADHO is an acronym and cannot do anything of itself, thinking of it as a framework seems appropriate. SB reminds the SC that some of ADHO's most important activities include institutional websites, discussion lists, fostering new organizations, and running the conference. The research that we do, on the other hand, takes place outside the frame of ADHO. EB, BB, and KDO encouraged that diversity be considered an important value within ADHO, and MG suggested that ADHO encourage growth of DH across the globe.

KDO suggested that the SC seemed to have a broad consensus of what ADHO is, but now needed to tackle the question of which tasks are done by ADHO and how they are financed. The new governance structure calls for an Executive Board to conduct day-to-day business while the COB sets a broad strategy. But both of these organizations depend on knowing how things will be paid for. As such, it was important to continue the discussion about financial scenarios.

Since finances are tied to membership, JM reminded everyone that traditionally, the way to join a CO was by subscription to *DSH*. Since c. 2012, different COs have experimented with a member-only option through OUP. In the future, the SC is planning for people to be able to join COs without going through OUP for any part of the process. JM suggests that the MSF model for

finances makes non-OUP membership more tenable for ADHO and helps to simultaneously make clear the relationship between members and COs, on the one hand, and COs and ADHO, on the other hand. MG spoke to the importance he sees in separating CO membership from the OUP infrastructure. PA indicates that for the two smaller COs he is associated with (centerNet and aADH) that OUP is a benefit insofar as it means they do not have to invest in the infrastructure for managing membership. When COs are small, this benefit is meaningful.

Many members voiced support for the MSF model, while others voiced concern. KDO suggested returning to the question of finances on Tuesday and that a small group from the SC put together a proposal. SB, JM, and SS volunteer to create more tangible financial scenarios. A straw vote was called for to get a general sense of the sentiment in the room regarding the MSF model. A majority of participants in the room (not simply the voting members) was, at this moment, in favor of the MSF model. The rest of the discussion was slated for Tuesday's meeting.

14.00 Conference reports (45 minutes)

DH2018 [PC Report](#) (Glen Worthey and Élika Ortega) (10 minutes)

The PC Chairs for DH2018 presented their report together. There were a number of innovations in how the PC worked this year. First, the PC was co-chaired, a practice that they recommend continuing given the amount of work required from the PC Chairs. They noted that they perhaps communicated less often with the full PC than past chairs might have done insofar as they had a co-chair to communicate with. Second, they increased the number of members of the PC to a full two members from each CO. This insured equal representation from each CO, lessened individual workloads on PC members, and made it easier to achieve quorum for voting, so is also a practice they recommend continuing. Third, they adopted a new calendar for the submission and review process, with the goal of preventing so much work for the PC over the winter holidays. They indicated that they were not sure whether they observed many concrete improvements with the extended reviewing time. Fourth, because of limited venue space, non-peer-reviewed, ADHO-sponsored pre-conference activities displaced some potential peer-reviewed workshops, becoming de-facto "official parts of the pre-conference program." This led to some complaints from disappointed workshop proposers, leading the PC Chairs to recommend a much clearer set of policies and practices regarding such activities at future conferences. Fifth, they instituted double-blind peer review for the conference submissions, with the goal of diminishing problems of favoritism or inner-circle thinking. Some in the community were a bit concerned that the double-blind could lead to more critical reviews, but they did not observe this, and recommend continuing this practice. Based on their statistics, they believe there would be 115 new presenters at the conference, and they expect that this was due in part to the double-blind review. They indicated that some members of the committee advocated for a fully open review process, but there was not enough support to pursue that approach at the moment. Sixth, they dropped the bidding phase of the review process, in which reviewers would indicate which papers they would like to review.

The PC chairs reported being especially pleased with the diversity of language in the submissions. All conference proposals received at least 3 reviews, and half of the proposals received at least 4 reviews. A total of 2,100 reviews were conducted. The number of accepted papers was slightly lower than it has been in past conferences due to the space that was available in the conference venue.

More information will be available in the PC's final report to the SC.

DH2018 LO Report (Isabel Galina, Miriam Peña, Alberto Martínez) (10 minutes)

The Local Organizers (LOs) presented their report as a team. The overall cost of the conference was smaller than expected in the beginning (by about \$11,000) despite the fact that the venue was more expensive than expected. Funding from the Research Council of Mexico helped defray the costs.

There were 659 paid registrants. 82 individuals received grants from local universities, ACH, and ADHO bursaries. 232 individuals are participating in half-day workshops, and 43 individuals are involved in whole-day workshops.

Since the DH2017 conference was late and DH2018 was early, the LOs had a compressed schedule to accomplish everything. This is something that they recommend everyone remain cognizant of when selecting conference locations and dates.

The LOs referenced the [Conference Protocols](#) regularly, as well as the [Annex to the Protocols](#) and the [Guidelines for Prospective Local Organizers](#), and they noted that the conference has changed considerably since these documents were drafted. They suggest that the documents be updated.

The LOs had a meeting with the LOs for DH2019 in Utrecht. They held such a meeting in Montreal in 2017 and found it helpful. They recommend that this take place every year.

There was considerable difficulty connecting ConfTool to the Mexican banking system. European, US, and Canadian banks use a system that Mexican banks do not use. The result was that registration took place via PayPal, which took an 8% cut. The LOs recommend that as the conference moves to different locations around the world that both LOs and ADHO will need to address these issues.

LOs felt that creating a bilingual website (Spanish and English) took both money and time, but they felt it was worth it in the end.

More information will be available in the LOs' final report to the SC.

Finally, DJ suggested that coordinating the handoff of ConfTool from one set of PC chairs and LOs to the next might be worthwhile.

DH2019 LO Pre-conference Report (Joris van Eijnatten and Arjan van Hessen) (10 minutes)
see [written report](#)

The Utrecht LOs have previously sent a report to the SC about their work. Conference dates have been set for the second week of July.

The venue is a large theater / music hall in a central location. The whole facility has been rented for a week and can support many parallel sessions. They can handle as many as 1500 conference participants. A museum has been booked for the banquet, and the museum offered the location free of charge.

The LOs have wanted to help highlight work in Africa at the conference. They have, in conjunction with the PC, made a keynote invitation to this end. They are also hoping to see a number of attendees at the conference from Africa. In response to a question from JG about any considerations within the fee schedule for African attendees, the LOs indicated that they are working to get a grant to help people attend a pre-conference event in Leiden.

After examining past conference websites, the LOs made the decision to make the conference website in English only, but the CFP will appear in all five ADHO languages plus Portuguese.

The city of Utrecht has recently introduced a Utrecht Region Pass (<https://utrechtregionpass.com/>), which is ideal for conference attendees since it allow very easy access to transportation and museums. Hotels and dorms are less than a 30-minute walk to the conference venue, and there are other transportation options to get there.

14.45 Short break

15.00 Conference bids DH2021 (120 minutes)

- 15.00 Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
- 15.30 Daegu, South Korea
- 16.00 Tokyo, Japan
- 16.30 Discussion & decision

Following presentations by the different bidding groups, the SC deliberated and voted to hold DH2021 in Tokyo.

17.00 Committee reports & discussion (5 minutes each)

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

[Awards Committee](#) (KDO)

KDO opened a brief discussion about the Lisa Lena Opas-Hänninen Prize (LLOHP), which was introduced five years ago. It has proved difficult to award for two reasons: 1) the Awards Committee has not advertised it as much as it could and 2) organizers of different CO conferences have not asked to present the award.

Suggestions were made for considering different ways to award the prize, including the most highly rated abstract by a young scholar, the best poster by an early career scholar, or a publication. It would be important, however, to make sure the prize neither conflicts with the Fortier Prize nor depends on someone attending the conference. Others suggested that a difficulty with the prize is the lack of information about it and the process for awarding it.

Following the discussion, KDO proposed asking the Awards Committee to reimagine the LLOHP.

[Communications Committee](#)

The Communications Committee submitted a written report. Pietro Santachiara needs to step down, but Candice Lanus will continue in her position.

[Conference Coordinating Committee](#) (CCC)

OE suggested that the CCC reconsider the 3-year cycle for where the conference will take place. ME suggests this will result in more bidders. LM suggests that rather than mandating the geography we should simply encourage geographic diversity. DJ indicates the CCC is willing to look into this issue.

MG suggests CCC consider how to encourage bids to address the Conference Code of Conduct.

The SC also discussed workshops at the conference, which continue to be one of the most popular parts of the conference. A question is raised whether to add more space at the conference for workshops. Others express concern about the need to make sure that it is clear which workshops are peer-reviewed and which are not.

FC indicates that the PC for DH2019 is considering moving the deadlines for workshop proposals and the review process.

[Infrastructure Committee](#)

The Infrastructure Committee reported on three efforts.

1. The transition from Confluence to MediaWiki is ongoing. The SC's wiki has been a difficult since it is so large.
2. A test installation of CiviCRM has been created for DHd. They will open up testing to COs once they have gained more experience with the system. The goal is to become more independent from the OUP membership system.
3. At the 2017 SC meeting, a decision was reached to invest money in the development of ConValidator. The work has not yet been entirely finished, so the final payment is still pending. Feedback from the DH2018 LOs has been positive.

CS expressed thanks that he would be able to continue the work of the Committee as chair for another six months to see as many of these projects completed as possible.

[Ad-hoc Membership Committee](#)

FC reported briefly on the work of the Ad-Hoc Membership Committee, which was created at the SC meeting at DH2017. There was a general positive trend in membership. The largest increase came from people joining DHd. On the other end of the scale, Humanistica lost 80% of its members; this loss is probably related to the OUP membership system.

FC reported that there was an increase in joint memberships (those who join all the COs at once via OUP). He suggested that we consider whether to continue to offer this option as part of the governance transition.

OE mentioned that it is difficult for members to join COs from Russia, due to difficulties paying

OUP from within Russia. They are investigating this challenge.

ACH and centerNet expressed interest in piloting CiviCRM installations for membership. CS, MG, and LM will discuss this possibility and report back.

[Multilingualism/Multiculturalism Committee \(MLMC\)](#)

ML reports that during the past year the Committee welcomed observers from TADH, DHASA, as well as representatives from EADH's AOs. They also had talks with RedHD and the Argentinian DH association about how they might be involved with MLMC's work, allowing for greater diversity of languages and cultures in ADHO.

A decision was reached for each CO to have three pages on the ADHO site to describe itself. One page will be a general description; one page will be about the CO's activities; and the third page will be determined by the CO itself. MLMC recommends that each of these pages be in the local language of the CO and in English.

[Publications Committee](#) Report

While ASG was not yet present, the Committee's report elicited a discussion about the Conference's Book of Abstracts (BoA). ME suggested that the Committee might reconsider the title since it does not make clear, in some national contexts, the strength of the work that is published in the BoA. He also suggested that the Committee consider how the BoA might be profitably connected to Web of Science or SCOPUS. CS suggested considering producing separate PDFs for each abstract and assigning them DOIs to help raise their profile. ZB suggested that the Publications Committee involve someone from the Libraries and DH SIG in these discussions. KDO suggested asking Edward Vanhoutte (Editor of *DSH*) for his opinion.

The SC returned to the discussion of the Publications Committee on Tuesday morning.

Discussion (15 minutes)

As part of the discussion of all the committee reports, JG reminded each CO that they should provide the names of individuals for the 2020 PC as soon as possible.

17.30 Adjourn

Tuesday, 26 June, 9.00 - 13.00

Location: Sheraton Mexico City Maria Isabel Hotel, Salón Colonia

9.00 Coffee and tea

9.30 Introductions

9.36 DSH Reports and proposals (Øyvind 15 minutes)

See OUP's written report on the Meeting Documents page.

Since neither the Edward Vanhoutte (editor of *DSH*) nor an Oxford UP representative was able to attend Mexico City, the report was presented by OE. The journal is in good shape, both scholarly and financially. That said, it remains an open question what will happen to institutional subscriptions in both the mid- and long-terms. OUP does make the journal available at lower prices to developing parts of the world.

The most pressing challenge facing the journal is the difficulty of finding reviewers. A few years ago, *DSH* instituted a policy to have authors submitting a manuscript suggest reviewers; this policy has helped since the editorial team does not always know all the subfields. A suggestion was made that those who are accepted to the DH conference also be slated as potential reviewers. And since DH conference reviewers are already classified by keywords, they are another potential pool of reviewers. OE will discuss this suggestion with the editorial team.

As a reminder, the open access (OA) policies of *DSH* were discussed. Authors can pay an OA fee up front, and then the article is always accessible. ADHO also pays the OA fees for the annual conference proceedings issue. Finally, OUP will occasionally open an issue of the journal for a short time as an advertising strategy. A suggestion was made that another option for the Lisa Lena prize would be to pay the OA fees for an article in *DSH*.

Finally, the development and future of the journal is under constant discussion and this includes regular (re)appointments of the journal editor based on the established cycle. There is an editorial team behind the journal and any change of editor will be a well planned process with considerable overlap, as it has been in the past.

9.48 Publications Committee Report

With ASG now present, the SC returned briefly to the Publications Committee's report. ASG suggested that expanding the reviewer pool for *DSH* could also have benefits for *DHQ*, if the reviewer pools were shared.

ASG reports that Edward has asked for a larger budget to accommodate more pages, preferably

an additional 200 pages per year. With the current size of the journal, *DSH* cannot run thematic issues. ASG will ask Edward to indicate what an additional 200 pages would cost.

Over the last year, *DHQ* received 135 submissions in all categories with a 39% acceptance rate. 39 articles were published in 3 special issues, and an additional 8 special issues are pending. The journal received \$75,000 from a US government grant to help address some of the front-end issues (see <https://www.neh.gov/divisions/odh/grant-news/announcing-new-2017-odh-grant-awards>). Julia Flanders (editor of *DHQ*) indicates that they have a large backlog and would appreciate extra funding to support more work.

DSCN has moved to the Open Libraries of the Humanities platform, which has reduced costs. The journal is now minting DOIs for articles. They are hoping to catch up on their backlog and publish more. The journal is in good financial shape. As a reminder, there is a per-article charge for publishing in *DSCN*.

9.58 Voting on governance issues identified on Sunday (30 minutes)

The SC returned to the two proposed financial models, beginning by looking at a [Minimal Service Fee \(MSF\) model document](#) that had been prepared by SB, JM, and SS. The goal of the document was to flesh out what was in the IC recommendations, aiming to be more specific. The numbers are subject to change in a number of ways, and in particular the MSF that is used in the document. The real MSF would need to be set by the SC or the COB. Those who prepared the document felt that the MSF model recognizes that COs finances (and the finances of their members) can differ widely from other COs (and their members). The model leaves power in the hands of the CO to determine their membership fees, including with progressive scales. Finally, they wanted to emphasize that with ADHO's current finances, the MSF model results in no MSF being sent by the COs to ADHO. Instead, this model would act as an insurance policy against the future; it is a chance to determine how income will be generated *if* the overall financial picture changes.

In the discussion that followed, individuals again raised points for and against the MSF model. Arguments in favor of the MSF model included the following:

- The MSF model underscores the relationship between COs and ADHO, as well as COs and their members
- Insofar as the current ADHO budgeting process involves seeing spending a year after it has occurred, the MSF model can act as risk management
- The MSF model guards against changes in institutional subscriptions to *DSH*, and many library budgets are contracting
- The SC or the COB should have the ability to implement MSF waivers (full or partial) for

COs.

- The MSF model can be a mechanism for redistributing wealth, making income distribution more feasible.

Points made against the MSF model included the following:

- The MSF model might be understood to assume that ADHO's financial outlays should not change instead of recognizing that ADHO activities could shift to COs
- Insofar as ADHO is not currently facing a financial crisis, adopting an MSF model may discourage future COs from joining ADHO

In either model, it is clear that ADHO activities and priorities will continue to be set by the SC or the COB and will be reviewed and revised on an annual basis.

A discussion also ensued about the authority of the SC representatives. Although the SC members have the mandate to vote on governance issues, it is also preferable to enable voting representatives to discuss issues with the COs that they represent.

The SC discussed whether a document similar to the one created by SB, JM, and SS could be created for the no-service fee model and whether we could test both models over the coming year. Others suggested that making a decision about the financial model was critical for moving forward with the other governance decisions. JG made a motion to vote on the proposal, which was seconded by SB. In the discussion of the motion, it was acknowledged that details remained to be worked out but that that did not prevent having a vote on the motion. The motion carried, 8 in favor, with 4 abstentions. Since the motion to actually have the vote on the MSF carried, a motion was immediately proposed by JG to adopt the MSF model; TT seconded. The motion carried with 9 in favor, 3 against.

Since the motion carried, a call was made for a working group to hash out the details. In the end, JS, SS, JM, SB, and HS comprise the task force to work out the details. The task force indicated that they would report by 29 June 2018 when they would have their report prepared.

10.45 Brief break (15 minutes)

11.00 New committee and officer appointments (45 minutes)

Discussion confidential.

After confidential discussions about committee and officer appointments, the SC appointed the

following individuals to the following positions:

- Brian Croxall and Maciej Eder as ADHO Secretariat
- Micki Kaufman as Chair of the Awards Committee
- Diane Jakacki as Chair of the Conference Coordinating Committee
- Matt Gold as chair of the Ad-Hoc Membership Committee

The Secretariat will contact those not at the meeting to let them know of their appointments.

11.15 Review of financial impact of decisions made, and adjustments as needed (15 minutes)

See [Revised budget spreadsheet](#)

The SC returned to the subject of the annual budget as it still needed to approve the budget for FY2018 (July 2018 – June 2019). In the discussion, it became clear that not all of the ADHO journals had received communiqués asking them for a formal budget request for the coming year. The proposed budget also did not include a request from the Infrastructure Committee related to the CiviCRM trials. Following discussion, a motion was made for the treasurers to revise the budget, including making formal requests for budget items to the different committees and ADHO journals. The motion was approved, 12-0.

JG suggests that there be a calendar in place for budget requests prior to each year's SC meeting.

11.45 Next steps in governance change (45 minutes)

The SC turned its attention again to discussing governance changes. In June, the SC had conducted a discussion via its email listserv about the Implementation Committee's suggestion in the "[Proposed Executive Board Scenarios](#)" document that the Chair of the Executive and the President of the COB should be the same person. This suggestion was based on the belief that ADHO's legal documents did not adequately allow for the separation of duties. The SC's online discussion suggested that the SC thought the two individuals should be different, for a number of reasons. Consequently, KDO sought legal advice in the Netherlands. The verdict was that the wording of the legal documents can be changed without too much difficulty, thereby making it possible to have the Chair and the President be two individuals.

The SC then discussed the proposed governance model of a COB and an Executive, including how the two bodies relate to one another. The intent, in general, is that the Executive would implement the decisions made by the COB. More specifically, the COB will be deciding what makes sense for COs to collaborate on at the ADHO level and what should be done at the CO

level only. The COB would have oversight of the action of the Executive, and the Executive would be legally bound to make sure that everything was taking place according to the Foundation's guidelines.

Concern was raised by some about the workload for the Executive as volunteers and what it would mean for them to be in the position of "simply" carrying out the will of the COB, to which they will not belong. Others voiced an opinion that responsibilities should be more broadly distributed than they currently are and that the model being proposed might concentrate even more work in the hands of a few volunteers. These volunteers could be overworked or hold too much power or, conceivably, both. JG indicated that the IC imagined that the Executive might seek additional, contracted help if needed; one example of this might be retaining an accountant (CPA).

The discussion about the COB and Executive ended with reminders that the impetus for this change arises from the increased amount of work as the number of COs has grown. While some parts of ADHO need to continue to be representative (e.g., the Awards committee), not every aspect of the organization should remain that way.

12.14 Coffee break (6 minutes)

12.20 Governance Discussion

The final discussion of the SC's meeting concerned the question of how representation in the COB would be determined. The IC had suggested [three possible models](#) that the SC considered:

1. One vote per CO;
2. Two representatives from each CO, one representative from each AO and SIG;
3. Range representation where a CO with membership under 30 would get one vote, a CO with membership between 30-100 would get two votes, and a CO with membership above 100 would get 3 votes.

The discussion touched on many points, including:

- the size at which the COB might be too large to deliberate effectively
- whether a larger COB might provide a better resource for more and better ideas
- recognition that the different COs differ greatly in number of members and that the question of representation is difficult
- whether AOs and SIGs deserve the same voting power in Scenario 2
- remembering ADHO is an alliance of organizations rather than members
- whether it is more important to provide representation based on number of members or based on the number of COs
- whether one decision or another would lead the AOs to apply to become full COs
- which scenario best facilitates new COs joining ADHO

- whether a fourth scenario might exist, that would allow for as many voices as we want that would then work to elect the COB
- which scenario is also the most fair and most democratic

KDO closed the meeting by noting thanking the participants and suggesting that the Chair and the Secretariat prepare a summary of the discussion.

13.03 Adjourn