The meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

Present for meeting: Matt Veatch (KSHRAB Coordinator and Kansas State Archivist), Michael Church (KSHRAB Deputy Coordinator and KSHS Digital Specialist), Jessica Heck (KSHRAB Administrative Assistant), Cliff Hight (Kansas State University Archivist), Sherry Williams (Curator of Collections, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas). Absent from meeting: Audrey Coleman (Senior Archivist, Dole Institute of Politics), Margaret Hermstein (Register of Deeds, Harvey County).

SCHOLARSHIPS:
Matt began the meeting by discussing KSHRAB scholarships, which were advertised for the Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) from mid-February through early April. Despite the board’s best efforts, no applications for scholarships were submitted. Cliff indicated that the Society of American Archivists (SAA) sent out a call for individuals who wanted to host workshops at the conference. He mentioned that Kansas State University will be hosting a workshop at the SAA Conference. The board agreed to co-host the workshop, which will likely be about rights and confidentiality and advanced appraisal.

KANSAS DIGITAL ACCESS TO HISTORICAL RECORDS (KDAHR) GRANT REVIEWS:
Matt reviewed aspects of the KDAHR grant application, specifically that the board had extended the deadline from March 25, 2017 to April 14, 2017. Extending the deadline was successful in that it generated three new applications, as well as one application revision. The board initiated grant reviews by discussing each application individually:

Abilene Public Library: The Abilene Public Library requested funds to digitized newspapers and yearbooks. Sherry believed that they should not be considered for a grant because their application did not meet KDAHR criteria. Cliff expressed concerns that many public libraries seem to be creating websites for digitized material without proper permissions. Michael indicated that most libraries have avoided problems by shifting responsibilities between the hosting service and the actual library. The board agreed that this application did not fit KDAHR requirements and would likely not receive grant funding.

Bonner Springs Historic Preservation Society, Inc.: Sherry expressed little patience for this application because it had no clear action plan or concept of what would be digitized. Cliff agreed with Sherry, and added that most of their project costs were inconsistent and did not make sense. Michael argued that the application was salvageable, if the board would be willing to help the applicant identify proper material for digitization, but he did worry that the proposed project would not be completed by the due date. Sherry proposed, and the board agreed, that the applicant should submit an application next year and that the board work with them to fix and define their application.
**Butler County Historical Museum:** Michael liked the Butler County application because it focused in on a set of materials, presented a reasonable use of funds, had a predictable project plan, and a well-equipped staff. Michael was worried that the application had no plan for submission or defined digital standards. Sherry also mentioned that the application proposed a good use of outside funds, but stressed that the board would have to ask them to elaborate on their scanning procedure. Cliff mentioned that he found some of the application’s details lacking, but he agreed to support it if they elaborated on an accurate total cost for the project. Matt added that the Butler County community seemed committed to the project, but that the board would need to work with them to make sure that they submit all of their material to Kansas Memory in addition to adding it to their own web page.

**Franklin County:** Matt thought that the Franklin County application was well written, but that it made no plan for a deliverable project. Michael added that Franklin County should have proposed using the money to update their existing platform and then integrate the item information into the website. Matt suggested that approval be contingent on the Historical Society’s willingness to rework their plan so that a functioning website is presented at the conclusion of the grant project. Sherry agreed that the application was well-written and that it was worth supporting if their work-flow was negotiated. Cliff agreed, but pointed out that the application contained a number of budget discrepancies. Michael expressed his concern about the number of files proposed for digitization, as well as the amount of work the Historical Society proposed to complete within the grant cycle; Michael did not believe that proposed 160 hours were necessary to complete that amount of work.

**Hesston Public Library:** Cliff stated that the Hesston proposal was reasonable; Sherry agreed, stating that their proposal was strong, the material was significant, and the project was well thought-out. Michael worried that the proposed digitization would pose problems because of copyright issues. Matt agreed, and added that the proposed content seemed excessive. Michael reasoned that, depending on the format used and the metadata required to support it, the content size would be reasonable. Michael also added that the institution did not talk through the metadata required to support the project. Matt proposed that the application was salvageable, so long as the Library created digitized material in discreet pieces.

**Morris County:** Matt worried that the Morris County application was problematic because it depended on an outside vendor and was not clear on the collections they would be working with. Cliff agreed and added that the application would need re-working before it could be supported. Michael stated that he would be more supportive if they had focused on building a website and received support from the regional library system. Sherry agreed with the rest of the board, and argued that the application had potential, but not enough definition.

**NE Kansas Chapter #14:** Michael stated that the application was unclear about the project. Cliff questioned if the project would include any web hosting aside from Kansas memory – Michael reiterated that the project was unclear. Michael added that if the project included just transcriptions, it would be much more feasible, but that there was still uncertainty about what the digitization component entailed and what the corresponding metadata would look like. Despite concerns, Matt
argued that the project could be funded with clarification. Cliff agreed, and added that Vera needed to obtain permissions from the people she recorded.

**Wamego Public Library:** Cliff worried that the library did not talk about copyright issues with some objects in their proposal. Sherry added that the project was interesting, but that she was not convinced that the proposed materials held real value or what their content was. Michael had concerns about the project plan and work flow because the library did not indicate how they’d note if they third party company would be digitizing to our standards. Additionally, the library did not include information about the creation of metadata. Michael stated that the library would need to seek samples from the vendor and provide them to the board at the onset of the project.

**Wellington:** Sherry and the rest of the board agreed that Wellington did not effectively argue that the documents in their collection were unique; instead, they proposed to digitize and work with items, like city directories, that are not unique in nature. Matt suggested that the board could encourage them to write a proposal about the unique materials in their collection, and be clear about the types of material that the board would not fund. The board agreed, but stressed that local history book collections would be better covered under other grants. Michael did find Wellington’s willingness to work with the South Central Kansas Library System (SCKLS) encouraging, but was skeptical that they might be working on a photograph collection with SCKLS, rather than applying for a grant.

**VOTING:**

Matt introduced a movement to eliminate the Abilene Public Library, Bonner Springs Historical Society, Morris County Historical Society, and Wellington Public Library. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.

Matt introduced a movement to approve the Butler County Historical Society’s application for $2,500 in funding, contingent on their acceptance of Kansas Memory requirements and standards, and an accurate total cost figure. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.

Michael introduced a movement to approve the Franklin County Historical Society (Old Depot Museum)’s application for $2,500 in funding, contingent on their agreement to fund the creation of a website first, and use remaining funds for the revision of digitized materials. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.

Cliff introduced a movement to approve the Hesston Public Library’s application for $2,165 in funding, contingent on their ability to clarify who would create the metadata, and to be cognizant of copyright issues with their journal articles. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.

Sherry introduced a movement to approve the NE KS Chapter 14 application for $2,400 in funding, contingent on their willingness to add more information about digitization and the creation of audio files, as well as the obtaining of permission forms from interviewed subjects. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.
Matt introduced a movement to approve the Wamego Public Library’s application for $1,643 in funding, contingent on their agreement to obtain and provide digitization samples from their vendor, determine who will create metadata, and send all photographs in their collection to be digitized. The movement was seconded and approved by the board.

**FUNDING 2018/2019:**

Michael informed the board that the grant application for 2018/2019 was submitted and some changes had been made. Cost share for the upcoming application now include indirect costs and the percentage was reduced to 25%. CoSA dues were also shifted to direct costs (so that the board will pay $2000 in direct costs and $500 in cost share). Michael noted that the application asked for more direct costs, so the board can offer $3,000 grants, rather than $2,500, for a total for $15,000 per year.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.