
9:12 - 17.30

London UK, University College London
The South Wing G12 Council Room, Gower Street, WC1E 6BT London, UK

The chair thanks Melissa Terras and UCL for hosting the meeting and everybody for attending. He welcomes Paul Vetch and thanks him for joining us. Chair reminds us that the focus of this mid-term meeting is on strategic issues.

1. Attendance and agenda

Attending:
- David Beavan (DB)
- Jan Christoph Meister (Chair) (JCM)
- John Nerbonne (President) (JN)
- Arianna Ciula (Acting Secretary) (AC)
- Karina van Dalen-Oskam (KvDO)
- Øyvind Eide (ØE)
- Elena González-Blanco (EGB)
- Maurizio Lana (ML)
- Espen Ore (EO)
- Jan Rybicki (JR)
- Paul Spence (Treasurer) (PS)
- Melissa Terras (Outgoing Secretary) (MT)
- Edward Vanhoutte (LLC Editor-in-Chief) (EV)

Apologies:
- Claire Clivaz (CC)
- Leif Isaksen (LI)
Tomoji Tabata (TT)

In addition to executive committee members, we have also invited Paul Vetch (PV) as incoming treasurer in 2014 and Harold Short (HS) to join us. As chair of the ADHO admissions committee, HS is involved in issues concerning ADHO associate organisations with respect to new membership and financial models (item 10.i). In addition he has been invited to present the issues around the OUP contract renewal (item 11).

Changes to the agenda are discussed and approved:

A brief update on DH Humanists in Poland, South Africa DH developments and Portuguese DH association are added to item 9.

Agenda is approved.

2. Minutes Jul. 2013, and matters arising

Relevant documents in Agora:

Minutes, Exec, Lincoln 2013 (AC)

2.i Special attention to action items

Chair prompts committee members to check and report on action points.

EO mentions that he had inherited two action points from mid-term meeting in Ghent (2012): his involvement with ADHO MLMC had been taken care of, while his role in recruiting an EADH newsletter editor is carried over (Action on EO to lead initiative in recruiting an EADH newsletter editor).

JN reminds that the DH conference Call For Papers (CFP) is passed to ADHO MLMC committee who then coordinates volunteer translation. MT reminds us that this year the CFP was published in 23 languages; submissions were received in 19 different languages.

All action items from Lincoln are dealt with or in the process of being ticked off.

Minutes from Lincoln were approved: JN proposed, PS seconded. Voted nem con.
3. Treasurer’s Report

Relevant documents in Agora:

- Mid-term financial report (PS)
- ADHO Budget Revenue Distribution 2012/2013 (Final) (PS)

3.i Mid-term financial review

PS states that there is not much to report since the summer meeting. PS and PV already had a meeting connected to the handover on the finances, which formally takes place on 1 January 2014. Most changes will take place next month and in the early spring. The financial impact of 2013 will be recorded in the financial summary for 2013, to be prepared in spring 2014; information about consortia is not provided by OUP until spring. However, early indication is that income will be generally similar to last year and possibly slightly up, but without major changes. Total income last year was £133,188 (of which 70% flows to EADH, which is then shared at ADHO level, and it will be similar this year, possibly a couple of thousands more). The journal remains the major source for income (see minutes of the executive meeting in Lincoln for more details). The EADH revenue distribution in 2013 amounted to £14,304. Future fluctuations will depends on the decisions taken at the ADHO level decisions next summer, as well as during the current meeting.

PS states that EADH has historically faced criticism that our reserves are high in relation to our expenditure levels and this has become more evident now that our income is higher, although this is artificially inflated to some extent due to the ADHO factor, which will be resolved once ADHO becomes financially independent. A word of caution too - if we lost income as a result of current membership/journal subscription proposals, it is entirely possible that we could lose something like 20% of our income. The next 2-3 years will test our business model in this respect. ADHO budgeting has become stable but is also entering a transitional phase. There was a high increase in ADHO budget available for this year (£95,420), in part due to surplus from the previous year. Currently EADH is a legal entity (a charity based in England and Wales) while ADHO hasn't had legal status until now (PS records thanks to JN and KvDO for their work on this; see item 6.i). This newly established legal status will allows us to separate ADHO and EADH accounts.

PS adds that EADH has recently developed a more formal internal budgeting system. Expenditure matches revenue (around £14,000), in addition to which there is a section for investing any surplus; however, PS recommends we look for new sources of income so as not to be so reliant on the journal revenues.
PS reminds us that both PV, as EADH treasurer, and Jarom McDonald, as ADHO treasurer, will take over from him on 1\textsuperscript{st} of January 2014.

PS outgoing message for this committee is that new incoming streams should be sought and expenditures planned, while also providing for a strategic long term spending plan.

All record thanks to PS for all his work for EADH and for ADHO.

Chair highlights that thanks to PS we have a formal EADH budget, crucial to plan ahead and particularly important in light of the upcoming substructures in the framework of the associate organisations currently being set up.

JN suggests motion to accept budget, DB seconds. All in favour.

4. Editor’s Report

Relevant documents in Agora:

- LLC Editor’s Report 2013 ytd (EV)

EV reports that all is going very well with respect to the journal. OUP statistics are more accurate now. The report uploaded to Agora was written before the thematic issues were out (two thematic issues this year: DH proceedings and Computational model for narrative studies).

EV reports that one member of the editorial team – Ron Van den Brande - has asked to give release of his duties. Ron did a wonderful job in the last couple of years, a service we should keep providing to the community. EV states that it is not easy to find a suitable substitute and he welcomes suggestions (Action on all to send suggestions for a future reviews editor).

EV had discussions with OUP connected to his action points from Lincoln (mainly name of the journal and issue connected to ISSN number); OUP promised to change this through discussion with HS.

EV moves to the issue of free access. The proceedings of DH 2012 conference are freely accessible online for a period of 3 months; EV notes that access for free limited to a period of time is not open access. At the moment this is the best model we can exploit before renegotiation for tender. He thinks the same could be done for the next DH proceedings issue. Following a question from the Chair about obtaining a 6 month period of free access, EV states that this should be part of the renegotiation of the contract (action
on EV to explore possible renegotiation with OUP of term for free access of journal issues to 6 rather than current 3 months as part of OUP contract renewal. Concerning OUP contract renewal see also item 11.

Given the vast and enlarging amount of languages and topics in DH, EV is always looking for more reviewers. In addition, the inclusion of diverse academic cultures makes it challenging for chief editor to assess the quality of peer review in a different academic culture.

Regarding a possible new format for the editorial board (currently not ideal; difficult to manage based on expiring terms etc.), EV clarifies that he still intends to discuss it with the editorial team first. He intends to set up a new editorial board with people that can commit time to the journal and that he can call upon as needed. Chair reminds us that other Constituent Associations have a similar problem; situation can become unwieldy with rising complexity of ADHO structure of committees.

MT states that she feels uncomfortable to be listed as member of the editorial board without actually doing any work. ØE suggests that being listed as member may be seen by some as an important element of recognition for the work done within ADHO with respect to other mansions.

EO asks about publication line. EV confirms that 2014 is already full (DH 2013 issue is in the pipeline already). So a submission received today might not be published before summer 2015. This brings up issue of page number, increases subscription fees and related issues.

EV announces that he will be working with Julianne Nhyan at University College London (UCL) to hand over the Bulletin papers to for a publication project based at UCL. Chair records our thanks to UCL for accepting this work on our behalf.

EO suggests motion to accept the report, ØE seconds. All in favour.

Chair records thanks to EV for his hard work on our flagship publication.

5. Membership report

Relevant documents in Agora:

- EADH Membership Report November 2013 (DB)
DB mentions the issue we have been experiencing at DH conferences registration desks where membership numbers are not available for quick reference and check; this process slows things down and is difficult to manage. Referring to his report, DB explains the boosting of ADHO joint membership in comparison with the decrease of specific EADH membership. The uptake of the membership only option is outstanding (we will come back to this under item 10). The number of complaints about membership update has dropped. As stated in the past, OUP website doesn't provide the flexibility we would like to have.

Chair records thanks to DB.

PS makes some comments on the financial point of view; the proportion of people subscribing to one organisation or the other is related to the venue of the conference. It would be interesting to see how this fluctuation due to simply geographic implications will change with DH taking place in Europe in 2014. We must make sure we are promoting EADH membership in Europe.

Chair adds observation that revenue generated from individual subscriptions is shared equally across organisations so it doesn't reflect the regional origin (i.e. the strength of each regional association). Hence such disproportion could increase in the future.

The discussions moves again to how best EADH can fill its role as DH European association and boost membership accordingly.

ML suggests of sending warnings about subscriptions renewals (Action on DB to investigate the possibility to follow up OUP renewal messages with more personal messages, sent by membership officer).

The perception is that many joint members are based in Europe (Action on DB to find out how many of the ADHO joint members are actually based in Europe).

The main problem with making people aware of EADH is a communication problem: the benefits of subscription to EADH should be made explicit. An additional issue is connected to the perception of EADH being a mainly British association; it was agreed that this historical backload should also be addressed with targeted communication strategies.

Chair mentions that we should tackle this as a benefits package issue, a marketing exercise that was also addressed at the EADH-AIUCD meeting in Rome, October 2013. Chair also dwells on the issue of joint membership; he finds it problematic because it raises issues of representation. Action to mark this topic as something to be dealt with another time.
JR suggests motion to accept the report, MT seconds. All in favour.

6. **ADHO update**

6.i **Legal status**

JN reports on the work done by him and KvDO in the last couple of months concerning the legal status of ADHO. As from September 25th, ADHO became a legal foundation based in the Netherlands; amongst other things, this makes it possible for ADHO to have its own bank account. KvDO mentions that she is in touch with the bank about specific details that should be sorted out very soon.

PS expresses personal thanks but also all record thanks to JN and KvDO for their very important role on this.

6.ii **Lisa Lena prize**

Relevant documents in Agora:

- Lisa Lena Opas-Hänninen Young Scholar Prizes (ØE)

ØE summarises briefly that the proposal for this new prize was accepted by ADHO Steering Committee (see relevant document in Agora) and it is now back in the hands of the ADHO Awards committee for the elaboration of a specific protocol.

JN mentions that there will be an award next summer at the Methods in Dialectology XV conference in Groningen (11-15 August 2014; see http://www.methods-xv.net/); so the first award will be in 2014. ØE reminds us that the ordinary process will be for a proposal to go through the ADHO Awards committee but for time issues this was not possible this year.

Chair record thanks to ØE for his work on this.

7. **Association initiatives, tasks**

7.i **Elections 2014**
7.i.a Nomination Committee (2014)
JN summarises what is the work involved with respect to the nomination committee. He is willing to volunteer and chair the committee. ML also volunteers. So the nomination committee for 2014 will include: JCM, JN (chair) and ML.

ØE proposes, DB seconds. Voted nem con.

7.i.b Election of Secretary (2014-2017)
Chair and all record thanks to MT for all her hard work as outgoing secretary and for increasing the pace of documentation. She set high standards and her work has increased the professionalism of the association.

As stated by the chair in an email sent to the executive on the 25th of November 2013, AC accepted her nomination as secretary from 2014.

Chair reminds us about the procedures on the elections of the secretary and records that we are happy with AC acceptance.

AC is asked to leave the room for the deliberation and discussion to take place in the open.

JR nominates AC as secretary, ØE seconds. Voted nem con.

Chair record thanks to AC for her work so far.

7.ii Committee appointments

JR accepted our nomination as EADH representative on the ADHO Standing Committee on Communications (email from Chair to the executive mailing list on October 17, 2013).

This information is just for the committee to take good note.

7.iii Report by Small Grants Committee

7.iii.a Report on Grants made early in 2013
KvDO notes that there is no need to go into details about this. So we move to the next item in the agenda.

7.iii.b Report on supported projects

Chair asks if all reports have been uploaded to the website. ML wrote twice to the awarded applicants; only 4 out of 8 answered with a report (Action on PV and LI to work together with Small Grants Committee to envisage a better mechanism to enforce delivery of reports from grantees).

7.iii.c. Report on current applications

Relevant documents in Agora:

- Small Grants report (LI)

This year’s Small Grants Committee is composed of LI (chair), KvDO, CC and EGB (ML left the committee given that he is an applicant and will join again after the evaluation phase is completed).

In consultation with PS, and agreement with the Executive Committee, this committee has agreed to consider proposals of up to €2000 from a total spend of €15,000. The call text is available at: http://www.allc.org/support/eadh-support/eadh-small-grants-call-proposals

A call for proposals was sent out on October 16 with a deadline of November 17. Overall the committee received 24 eligible proposals, totalling €38,662.75 and they are now in the process of evaluating them. They expect to inform successful parties that their proposal has been funded by December 20th.

Some note following from LI's report:

- Events vs project is a more or less even split (11 applications for events vs. 13 application for project support)
- There is fairly good distribution across 12 countries:
  - Italy (5)
  - Germany (4)
  - Spain (3)
  - Netherlands (2)
  - UK (2)
AC reminds the committee that it has to approve formally the rankings of the Small Grants Committee. (Action on LI to circulate rankings of Small Grants Committee to meet deadline of notification to applicants - December 20).

Chair thanks the Small Grants Committee for the update.

7.iv Social media correspondents update and follow up

JR mentions that following our call for social media correspondents, we only got 4 candidatures (we had to select 3). Only one of them covered all criteria. So he proposes to re-issue the call targeting it better (e.g. students studying journalism and with English as First Certificate level). ML mentions that the work done with social media could contribute to how we actively change the perception of EADH as a mainly British association.

AC proposes for the call to be re-issued, JN seconds. All in favour.
Action on JR to re-issue call and to guide the social correspondents towards improving the image of EADH as European and multilingual association.

8. Discussion re: ADHO / centerNet – EADH interaction & sphere of interest-definition

Chair summarises the issues at stake concerning exchanges between ADHO/centerNet with respect to the two organisations activities in Europe. This relates to the attempt of some colleagues to establish a parallel European structure to EADH and without direct involvement of EADH.

A lively discussion followed with the following as main points being highlighted:
there was most likely not direct intention to exclude EADH; efforts were made to involve a higher number of Europeans in these discussions (the first meeting of CenterNet in Europe in London 2010 had indeed a more balanced European representation); however invitations were sent too late.

ADHO chair and CenterNet are attempting to change the perception of ADHO and CenterNet as being Anglo-centric.

CenterNet privileges structural over individual membership but it is also restructuring away from a regional setting.

Chair distinguishes the issues concerning CenterNet representation in Europe with protocol issues concerning communication across DH organisations. His suggests to formulate a brief protocol regulating such communication and collaboration that should be applied in the future.

Action on JN and JCM to draft concise protocol regulating the formal relationships between EADH and CenterNet with respect to EADH expectations.

In relation to what discussed above but also as a separate note, various members of the committee including the chair would welcome the involvement of a strong European player, Marin Dacos, in EASDH activities (e.g. marketing efforts, Open Access models). Action on JCM to discuss informally with CC how best to liaise with francophone association in the build up of their meeting in Lausanne July.

* * * Chair asks for a break at 10.55 am. We reconvene at 11.19 am. * * *

9. Integration of new national and/or linguistically or culturally focused groups primarily in Europe

Relevant documents in Agora:

- Notes on EADH-AIUCD meeting - Rome, October 2013 (AC)
- Message sent to Francophone DH list 29 Oct 2013 (AC, CC)

German DHd

Chair starts reporting that the DHd association will have its first conference on 25-28 March 2014, in Passau, Germany (see http://www.dig-hum.de/dhd-konferenz-2014). Local host also applied to our small grants scheme but the EADH chair is not directly involved in that application. The conference in Passau will act as a case study for various issues including models of subscription to EADH/ADHO. There are various technical details to tackle concerning the interface between EADH membership system and OUP system. A separate admin system has cost implications and it will have to be assessed (Wild Apricot is mentioned; chair reminds us that an evaluation of different systems is ongoing). OUP administration of membership is unfortunately a deal breaker, too
cumbersome and too complicated to manage. In addition, there are local resistances (e.g. Germans don't like paying by credit card).
Old members can do registration through the OUP system; the issues at stake concerning new members will be dealt with under item 9.ii below.
DHd is already an autonomous financial entity with its own bank account which is important as it means having the possibility to receive payments directly without the need of a shadow accounting system as it has happening within ADHO.

That discussion that followed verged on the important of the DHd event as model for other upcoming regional efforts willing to connect with EADH. It was suggested that a system for managing different models of membership could be presented as an EADH service to regional associations (EGB states that this would be a useful service for the Spanish association, for instance while EO mentions the possible interest based on Scandinavian developments).

Chair summarises that we are in an experimental phase and we need one or two pilots’ after which EADH can be in the position to make an offer to accommodate various requirements.

**Italian AIUDC (including meeting at TEI 2013)**

ML mentions the AIUCD conference taking place in Padua in December, where JCM is invited as keynote speaker (see http://aiucd2013.dei.unipd.it/home). This will be a gathering of national DH centres.
ML mentions that AIUCD membership is quite mixed and includes many of librarians and archivists.

ML also summarises the outcome of the meeting between some members of the EADH executive (JCM, AC, EGB) and some of the AIUCD board including the president, Dino Buzzetti (see annex in Agora) that took place in Rome prior to the TEI meeting (October 2013). Chair mentions that the meeting in Rome was very helpful, not too formal and not overburden with expectations; it was important to maintain flexibility and was a very productive meeting.

**Francophone association (including ThatCamp St. Malo)**

JR mentions that the natural association to ADHO for the francophone association – a community that suffers of atomisation at the moment - might not be through EADH, given that this is not a French only association. He restates problem of perception of EADH as a British association.

Chair thanks JR for representing EADH at the ThatCamp meeting in St Malo (see http://thatcamp35.hypotheses.org/).
A discussion followed concerning mainly language of communication across European DH associations and diversity of academic cultures. The works of ADHO MLMC Committee and the newly established ADHO GO::DH Special Interest Group are mentioned. Chair summarises that the positive issues of accessibility of using English – serving the functions of a lingua franca - should be highlighted; however rules of courtesy and awareness of cultural references could strengthen the protocol recently adopted by ADHO towards a more inclusive framework.

**Spanish HDH and Digital Hispanist association**

EGB reports on the Spanish association HDH, which currently includes around 60 members. EADH is unknown in the Spanish community, but she states HDH is in need of support from us. EGB would like for the Spanish association to be aware of the various models of affiliation discussed so far, so that HDH could also make a proposal of collaboration with us.

PS mentions also the Mexican-based and potentially South American association.

EGB reminds us that HDH is truly open as far as its possible association to ADHO is concerned, but its truly focused on Europe (language-wise not just Spanish by the way, but also Catalan and Basque). EGB thinks it's important to keep the identities separate (e.g. teaching systems).

In the discussion that followed, the HDH situation - carrying a strong European focus – is compared with Francophone association that seems to want to overtake its European base. The committee acknowledges that our challenge is to account for a multidimensional framework while at the same time operating within a hierarchical structure that includes formal/financial models of associate organisations.

Chair proposes to start an initiative to write up a combined set of missions statements and benefits package for EADH that outlines our take on these issues. This document would avoid getting into details of defining rigid substructures but serve as our presentation to other groups. Action on EGB, CC, ML and JR to draft a combined set of missions statements (e.g. welcome statement to EADH associate organisations that have decided to join us based on geographical proximity, inclusive yet defined cultural identity) and benefits package (e.g. common research avenues and publication venues) that outlines EADH take on the issues around ADHO associate organisations (draft by mid February).
EGB asks for some information about benefits package of associating with EADH to be shared with HDH right now. Chair is in favour, Action on EGB to circulate some ideas concerning the benefits package of joining EADH as associate organisation to share with HDH (refer to notes produced by AC following EADH/AIUCD meeting, Oct 2013, in Agora).

**DH Humanists in Poland**

JR mentions very briefly ongoing new developments in Poland to establish a national DH association.

**DH Benelux foundation**

KvDO reports on the Benelux foundation which includes the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg (many languages and dialects involved but English chosen as communication language). First event (see [http://dhbenelux.org/dhbenelux-2014-conference/](http://dhbenelux.org/dhbenelux-2014-conference/)) will take place on the 13th of June in the Hague; it is organised by a partnership between the Huygens institute and the National Library. Benelux has postponed decision to a later point in time about whether to become a more formal association; for now its scope is inclusive and the committee is quite large.

**Israeli DH**

Chair reports on a recently established (6 November 2013) Israeli DH organisation which contacted us (EO reminds us that there was an ALLC conference in the early days in Jerusalem: so we in a way are re-establishing contacts). Chair asks the committee for its support to visit them most likely in April (Haifa).

A discussion opened about inclusiveness towards other players in the Middle East. ØE mentions that it won't be possible to have a Middle Eastern organisation acting as umbrella. AC reminds us also that links/support between EADH and other organisations should not only be based on geographically proximity (e.g. Japan, South Africa). EV stresses that EADH could have a mediating role towards funding channels and policy definitions; he stresses the importance of teaming up for research funding.

Chair summarises that our benefits package should be pragmatic and explicitly open to organisations that cannot apply directly to EU funding.

Committee in principle support the idea of chair visiting Israeli DH and having an exploratory exchange similar to the EADH-AIUCD meeting in Rome.
South Africa DH developments

EV mentions he was invited to North-West University in South Africa where there is a team of researchers working with language technologies. North-West is also taking the lead in setting up a DH organisation promoting, amongst other things, postdoc scholarship in Europe.

AC mentions that she also met Justus Roux in Paris and London; she reports of the same interesting developments of a DH hub for Africa more in general.

Being our chair half-based in South Africa should facilitate future discussions and opportunities on this front.

Portuguese association

PS attended the meeting of the Portuguese association launched in St Paolo, Brazil, last October (http://seminariohumanidadesdigitais.wordpress.com/) and states that ADHO is as more natural connection for such Portuguese/Brazilian association.

Chair puts forward the proposal of an event with a genuine outreach scope, where we would invite representatives of the groups outlined above to an open exchange of ideas. This would have cost implications of course. Action on ØE to investigate possibilities and practicalities (e.g. scope, financial implications, pros and cons, how best to communicate it at the ADHO level possibly in conjunction with GO::DH) of an EADH outreach event, where EADH invites representatives of actual and potential associate organisations and relevant groups for an open exchange. EGB offers to help as liaise with Latin America if useful.

9.ii Decision on DHd becoming an associated organisation

Relevant documents in Agora:

Regional Association Application DHd (JCM)

Chair is also DHd chair so he excuses himself for wearing two hats in this occasion but explains that he sees his role here as simple presenter of this proposal. DHd is willing to become an associate organisation of EADH by making it compulsory for its members to also be members of EADH. Chair mentions again complex issues connected to OUP membership interface. He also summarises the financial arrangement which basically follows HS original proposal (see Lincoln minutes): i.e. 50% of revenues flows back to DHd
after ADHO subtractions (the source revenue is shared across ADHO COs and not just with EADH). For the new members the issue is how much money will DHd pass back to ADHO (30% is proposed because of the cost of administrative management; indeed an autonomous system will bear its costs), but this might need some compromising: e.g. DHd could stick to the 50% across all its membership pool, but in return for its investment, EADH or ADHO would compensate DHd for the costs of implementing a model of membership management in its first year of set up (maximum of financial support foreseen: 1,600 Euros). Chair stresses that everything in this proposal could be re-negotiated in 12 months time.

The floor was opened for discussion. In general the committee welcomes this proposal and its exploratory value as one year pilot to be re-assessed in due time. Pragmatic issues of not raising the boundaries of complexity for new members to join, as well as issues such as flow of information with OUP and clashing of time schedules were raised (Action on JCM to initiate contact between Peter Gietz and DB to liaise with OUP on this).

9.iii Proposal/mandate from AIUCD

Relevant documents in Agora:

Annex 9.iii: draft proposal - formal agreement AIUCD-EADH (AC)

The president of AIUCD and former ALLC executive committee member, Dino Buzzetti (DB), informed the Chair on November 26 (2013) that the AIUCD Steering Committee had a proposal to be examined by EADH as a basis to draft a formal agreement between the two organisations, EADH and AIUCD. The AIUCD Steering Committee hopes for a satisfactory solution towards a mutual and gradual association process. While a full integration is impracticable at this moment, DB informed the chair that there is “a sincere willingness from the whole AIUCD steering committee towards starting a wholesome process of increasing partnership and cooperation.”

ML summarises the proposal (uploaded to Agora) that all AIUCD subscribers become EADH subscribers. They also asks for endorsement of AIUCD journal as well as representation within the EADH executive committee.

A discussion followed mainly on issues of formal, linguistic, and cultural representation and on the challenge to guarantee representation while also maintaining an agile body of decision making and keeping costs to attend meetings moderate. Different models of representations are discussed within the executive committee and as separate body (e.g. side council or forum of regional
associations representatives). In connection with these issues, an agreement is reached that the EADH chair should not be also a regional representative; chair informs us of his intention to resign as DHd chair in March 2014.

On the financial level, different membership types taking into account various levels of financial restrictions need to be accounted for; the chair reminds us that would not be in the interest of EADH to propose a flat rate, as some turn over for EADH in connection with new members of regional associations should be present for the process to be beneficial for all parties involved.

In conclusion, the committee welcomes the entry of DHd as associate organisation but flagged some issues for the proposal to be revised (e.g. EO stresses that DHd proposal as its stands does require a change in the constitution).

There was also agreement about the need to assure that associate organisations have representation in EADH.

Chair summarises that EADH will signal to both associations that their proposals are accepted but that the question of representation will be clarified in due course.

(Chair moves to the next item. Vote on this will be called upon later.)

The committee gets back to this issue later in the afternoon (16:50). Chair suggests that EADH comes up with a generic proposal to both association which AIUCD could have by its deadline (11 December); this would be a flexible model that could be useful for other organisations too. The proposal – combined with benefits package - will be build on what agreed under item 9 i.e. with a focus on benefits of affiliation to EADH (strong European focus, benefits of networking, bridge between policy/funding level and regional level) and through EADH to ADHO based on a per capita fee.

It was suggested that the Chair should not be involved in drafting this proposed counter-offer. Action on JN to take the lead on drafting - in consultation with JCM and ML - a one page generic proposal (eventually to be made public on our website) addressed to both DHd and AIUCD as counteroffer which focuses on benefits of affiliation to EADH and through EADH to ADHO based on a per capita fee paid to EADH. Such proposal should include a statement of intent to establish a structure of representation (e.g. advisory council to represent associate organisations within EADH governance) that would come into force by, e.g. July 2014 (so constitution can be amended if needed) and automatic EADH membership (by AIUCD conference, 11 December 2013). This should serve as flexible model for other organisations to join. The benefits package should have a mainly European focus (e.g. common access to European funding, coordinated networking; see also notes written by AC following EADH/AIUCD meeting, Oct 2013, in Agora; EADH as bridge between policy/funding level and regional level; see also ACH webpage for benefits).
ML suggests motion to accept DHd and AIUCD proposals with an official EADH reply as outlined above, JR seconds. Voted nem con.

* * * Chair breaks meeting at 13.20. Meeting is reconvened at 13.50. * * *

Chair welcomes HS who just joined the meeting. He wraps up the discussion about the DHd proposal; over lunch the exchange brought the idea of removing paragraph 8 of their proposal as its stands and replacing it by a general sentence about ensured representation. Chair can then bring proposal back to DHd executive and between now and March (when DHd members meet and can endorse the new structure) EADH could come up with a suitable representation model for discussion.

9.iv Improve engagement

Relevant documents in Agora:

- Proposal for EADH Conference Series (JN)

JN presents his proposal. He states that it would be good to coordinate the organisation with such an event with AIUCD or HDH. JN, EGB and ML could work on a more specific proposal including budget (burden on local organisers should be considered of course), schedule (such event shouldn’t happen at the same time as DH taking place in Europe) and structure (entire sessions in other languages could be encouraged without necessarily creating language ghettos as it happened in ALLC-ACH 1994). Chair mentions possibility of rotating in sync with national conferences (i.e. we could envisage one day of EADH organisation embedded in a national conference).

EGB informs us about the HDH conference taking place in Madrid in 2015 (final decision will be confirmed by end of December) – this could be a suitable venue. Other ideas are brought forward such as link to EU chairmanship (and in general to Horizon2020) and keynotes expenses covered with the support foreign ministries. Submission numbers could grow extensively but attendance without submissions would also be more accessible for Europeans compared to DH conferences. PS points out that submission numbers may exceed capacity.

Action on EGB to inform committee if HDH conference to take place in Madrid in 2015 (decision by end of December 2013) could be the first venue for an EADH Conference series.

JN suggests motions, JCM seconds. Voted nem con.
10. New membership and financial models

Relevant documents in Agora:
- ADHO membership modelling (HS)
- Annexes 10.i: Membership-only models (HS)
- Associate Organisations: discussion paper (HS)

10.i Background information & presentation of models

HS summarises model of COs he drafted for ADHO last summer. ADHO already had provisions for **affiliate organisations** formalised through MOA (Memorandum of Agreement e.g. on discounts for conferences). HS mentions in particular the explorative meeting held by ELRA in Paris in November (AC and Elisabeth Burr were asked to attend on behalf of ADHO); the follow up with ELRA could be an example of possible linkages to develop into agreements for affiliate organisations. HS was also approached by TEI treasurer John Unsworth for the TEI to join as affiliate organisation. Discussion about **associate organisations** developed in relation to the emergence or existence of organisation created e.g. at the national level (COs have indeed geographical remits). The first idea was to include regional chapters within existing COs; but it emerged that there might be organisations that are language-based and cross the national dimension that way. He clarifies also the idea of **fledging organisation** (intended as being at an intermediate stage with enough members – a minimum number has not decided yet - to form an association, but not enough maturity to become a CO), a category which encompasses cases such as JADH that could not be a CO from the start and had to be supported to set the process up in financial terms.

HS moves to explain the funding operation of money coming in and going out. Last summer in Nebraska ADHO agreed to introduce the **membership only subscription** available to everybody (not only for students as it was before). Amongst the associate organisations, the membership only option might end up becoming quite attractive. To sum up, one becomes a member of an associate organisation by

1. membership only fee or
2. additional fee which would include also the subscription to the journal.

In this model there would not be any difference between COs and associate organisations as far as the money that comes in is concerned – JN agrees that simplicity would argue for that; Chair states however that practical issues wouldn’t though (e.g. different fees based on wealth of countries seem more reasonable).
Income from individual membership plus income from institutional subscriptions are aggregated into ADHO general revenue, but still counting the proportion for which each COs is responsible. Other money going out is connected to subventions to the 4 publications (3 of which are completely Open Access). Other expenditures are related to activities organised at the ADHO level. What remains after expenses is distributed proportionally across COs according to responsibilities for that income as mentioned above (note that there is also a minimum disbursement for each CO).

The revision of the models presented in Nebraska is based on the discussion HS had had with DHd chair (JCM) over the past months. Based on this discussion, the figure for associate organisations to join in and to buy access to all ADHO membership benefits was proposed to be at 50% of income generated through individual membership fees.

Chair asks to clarify the point about individual membership; currently a flat rate is being applied across COs not calculated on a pro rata basis; while in the case of associate organisations that redistribution is based on numbers; what would happen if EADH attracted e.g. 200 members? that differential could start playing a role; if the ratio changes, then there could be a problem. HS thinks his model account for this problem but will dwell on that later.

10.ii Alternate ‘membership only’ benefits packages

HS starts explaining the membership only issues and in his report follow the narrative accompanying the spreadsheets uploaded in Agora. He didn’t go beyond the 3 models proposed because that showed him that dropping down the subscription fee to 50 USD wouldn’t affect the income extensively.

AC and ØE both raise issues concerning institutional membership which is assumed not to be affected by flexible membership only models we could decide to apply to respond to our diverse constituency of associate organisations, but which also reveals our main weakness: the substantial part of our income is controlled mainly by what we cannot control, institutions. However, ØE summarises that this move towards accommodating the needs of diverse associate organisations would indeed represent a shift from a dependence from libraries to potentially a strongly individuals-based membership. HS agrees and reckons the decision has to be a strategical one, not a financial one.

Chair raises political issue about uniform flat rate; this is more practical of course (also given the parallel new setting of OUP rates starting in January), but takes away from each regional association the control over the rate to offer; one way out would be to propose a minimal rate.
The possibility to offer a multi-strands of benefits (e.g. model A, B, C based on economic differences across countries) is discussed. Indeed, the main benefit we currently offer is the reduction of DH conference rate, but with enlargement of membership this benefit might not be perceived as attractive (e.g. South Americans wouldn't attend DH conferences anyway). The problem of exchange rate and economic level are also raised; CenterNet model with free rate for certain countries could be a good starting framework; however this would certainly increase complexity of the membership system and interface.

HS moves to the last spreadsheet stating that associate organisation income is distributed to ADHO equally while expenditures are shared proportionally; the proposal is that the 50% income from associated organisations is distributed equally across associate organisations.
(HS notes that at the ADHO Steering Committee meeting in Lincoln, it was agreed not to overcome the threshold of 50% for ADHO expenditures. So what's left is used for redistribution.)

Chair summaries that the issue is indeed what would be the minimal rate for membership only subscription and if multiple rates are needed to accommodate multiple cases (e.g. different associations in different countries).
Chair also mentions the necessity of having in place a membership system to keep in touch with members.

As DHd representative, JCM summarises that the mode being proposed is based on current distribution/allocation of income and also on the assumption that the membership services are administrated by ADHO. However, associate organisations want to maintain political independence and, amongst other things, want to maintain control over their membership.
EO reflects on the fact that this model grows up of ADHO growing from ALLC-OUP model. HS reminds us indeed that ALLC was saved by the agreement with OUP; the upcoming ADHO strategic meeting (February 2014) is needed because the organisation grew faster than anybody had foreseen.

During the discussion, issues of centralisation vs. decentralisation are discussed. It is stressed that EADH is the only ADHO CO candidate presenting real cases of potential associate organisations. If EADH did not want to depend on ADHO model, each associate organisation would have to set up their rate (based on a minimal rate), but add up to account for specific benefits (e.g. for discount on conference fees) with no operation of redistribution taking place. The latter could be an alternative model.
In general, the committee is warned to see these as financial models only; issues of representation and membership management would have to be dealt separately, but are also important practical issues to be taken care of.

Chair summarises that we could have
  1. membership only option at flat rate (e.g. 50 USD) through OUP and
2. membership through regional organisations e.g. through local websites (in this case the regional organisation would pass money to EADH, part or all of which would go to ADHO for shared benefits).

Diverse scenarios of associations that want to associate themselves to EADH has to allow for a flexible system. HS suggests that some of the outcome of this discussion should feed the ADHO strategic meeting taking place in February. In the meantime, HS could reflect on the discussion and report to ADHO Steering Committee straight away.

JN thanks HS has for his fantastic work in showing the calculations for model 1 (membership only option) to go forward; his suggestion to ADHO would be to go for the lowest fee (i.e. 50 USD, 37 euros, 31 GBP) and allow for more time to discuss associate organisations membership models.

Asked whether the membership only model should be part of the joint model, HS agrees it should be so and based on DB’s suggestion the OUP subscription page could be amended from ‘Members - Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations’ to better communicate joint membership of COs, rather than suggesting it’s a membership of ADHO.

Chair records thanks to HS; his projections give us good orientation and show us that change is manageable. EADH will formulate a position and make a recommendation; our proposals will be informed by and based on what ADHO will agree to be the net value of an individual member to get benefits.

HS thinks that there are only net benefits for ADHO in having more members, and no real costs. Procedurally though it's important to provide OUP with practical suggestions. ADHO Steering Committee advice will be with us by Thursday next week – so EADH can communicate with OUP accordingly.

* * * Chair asks for a break at 16.00 am. We reconvene after 15 minutes. * * *

Chair mentions that we will most likely not dwell on items 13 and 14.

(proposal part 1) Chair summarises that the committee supports ADHO suggestion to introduce a membership only option at a rate to be defined.

DB proposes, MT seconds. Voted nem con.

(proposal part 2) Committee would welcome also a more flexible approach to respond to the local and cultural needs of our potential associate organisations with the understanding that regional organisations would administrate their own membership and pass part
of its income of membership through COs (e.g. EADH) and ADHO. We can formulate this in writing and communicate it to ADHO.

We would expect from ADHO some details on the minimal rathe number plus 2-3 categories systems that would take into consideration special needs and regions.

DB proposes, ØE seconds. Voted nem con.

HS responds that the first part of the proposal (OUP rates for membership only subscription) is a short term solution; he would gladly build the second part of the proposal for associated organisations and come back to us by the end of next week.

Chair moves to item 11 where we still need HS input.

10.iii Open Access models

See item 11 for some discussion on these.

10.iv Long-term exit strategy

Chair says we need a long-term 'exit strategy' from the current close cooperation with OUP while maintaining the financially essential benefits of this arrangement for ADHO.

Following a discussion on memberships models and models of expenditures, the agreement is for the incoming treasurer, PV, to model EADH substantial income without institutional members like libraries (new business model ready by meeting in Lausanne). Other associations and options could be used to build a 2-3 different scenarios to investigate what new financial models could be useful for our new set of substructures. Action on all to send PV suggestions about organisations which have financial models relying on revenues other than institutional memberships only/mainly. AC to create relevant category in AGORA.

11. OUP contract renewal

Chair summarizes that the current contract with OUP expires on 31st of December 2014. EADH needs to formulate its position towards a potential renewal of this contract for the 2015-2019 period.

HS mentions report of his meeting with OUP and reminds us that we had a continuation once; we could have a second automatic continuation (for a 5 years extension with a 6 months notice). Action on AC to get print and electronic copy of the OUP contract.
There have been discussion between Chair and HS earlier on about this. Continuing our relationship with OUP is not a disadvantage; based on the upcoming extension of the membership only option to all categories of potential new members, Chair suggests to renew the contract with OUP (in any case, there is an exit clause that would allows us to terminate the contract prematurely if needed; however one year notice is needed to cancel renewal).

EV raises the issues of the online archive that could stay with OUP if we ended the contract; this should be checked together with what consequences for digital libraries the termination would have. EV summarises that working with a very efficient and pleasant team at OUP has been a very good experience in term of management and workflow.

Chair summarises the discussion stating that we are happy about OUP performance financially speaking (OUP is very responsive on this front) and management wise, but that we have some concerns regarding public relationships and membership administration interface and operations.

Chair proposes we vote the renewal of the contract, JN seconds. Voted nem con.

Action on JCM to check OUP contract in consultation with EV on the issue of digital archive/digital libraries subscriptions and inform OUP about renewal of contract (negotiations on ownership of LLC online archive and consequences for digital libraries if we ended the contract could be presented as a condition of renewal).

HS reminds us that OUP needs an answer concerning experimentation with Open Access models (not free access) and different rates as they are related to the renewal process. OUP would like to experiment with these as a joint research project with us.

Action on Chair to clarify Open Access issues as email exchange with the executive.

12. Deployment of strategic funding

There was no time to discuss this issue further.

13. Infrastructure

13.i EADH Website and infrastructure
MT mentions that new website was up early on but there were some issues to tackle. Chair refers to email sent to executive on the 27th of October about new logo and design. Work is still ongoing and the committee will be kept abreast with new developments.

13.ii Change of working platform for executive

There was no time to discuss this issue.

14. Any other business

KvDO brings up issue of email overload. She asks whether formal votes could happen through Agora, for instance, or using subject lines in a smart manner. Action on AC and JCM to establish a good mechanism to formalise committee email exchanges when votes are required.

JR mentions the guidelines he drafted (in Agora) connected to Small Grants guidelines and evaluation criteria for next call (to favour applications from early career researchers is proposed as new criteria during the discussion). These are also based on experience as grantee. The use of web forms for each grant applications should be enforced; this would allow us to record data about applicants but also be re-use the documentation as template for reports, for instance.

It is proposed that the Small Grants committee works further on JR proposal and refine the criteria for the next call accordingly. Action on them to refine JR proposal on evaluation criteria for the next call and create template and web form for application and reporting.

Chair thanks committee and mandate them to use these refined guidelines for their current evaluation phase.

Chair thanks MT and UCL for hosting the meeting and all of us for contribution and attendance.

The meeting was concluded at 17.30.
### Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>▲ Send EV suggestions for a new LLC review editor&lt;br&gt;▲ Approve formally rankings of Small Grants Committee (2013 call) once circulated by LI.&lt;br&gt;▲ Send PV suggestions about organisations which have financial models relying on revenues other than institutional memberships only/mainly (towards new EADH business model).</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>▲ Investigate possibility to follow up OUP renewal messages with more personal messages (sent by him).&lt;br&gt;▲ Find out how many of the ADHO joint members are based in Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGB</td>
<td>▲ Liaise with CC, ML and JR to draft a combined set of missions statements (e.g. welcome statement to EADH associate organisations that have decided to join us based on geographical proximity, inclusive yet defined cultural identity) and benefits package (e.g. common research avenues and publication venues) that outlines EADH take on the issues around ADHO associate organisations. (draft by mid Feb).&lt;br&gt;▲ Circulate some ideas concerning the benefits package of joining EADH as associate organisation to share with HDH (refer to notes produced by AC following EADH/AIUCD meeting, Oct 2013, in Agora).&lt;br&gt;▲ Inform committee if HDH conference to take place in Madrid 2015 (decision by end of December 2013) could be the first venue for an EADH Conference series.</td>
<td>Done (2-pager) with contribution from others Done (2-pager)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AC   | Get print and electronic copy of the OUP contract (version with signature might still be with Lisa Lena's paper files)  
|      | Liaise with JCM to establish a good mechanism to formalise committee email exchanges when votes are required  
|      | Create relevant category in AGORA for suggestions of new business models. | Done (in PDF in Agora) |
| CC   | Liaise with EGB, ML and JR to draft a combined set of missions statements (e.g. welcome statement to EADH associate organisations that have decided to join us based on geographical proximity, inclusive yet defined cultural identity) and benefits package (e.g. common research avenues and publication venues) that outlines EADH take on the issues around ADHO associate organisations. (draft by mid Feb). | Done (2-pager) with contribution from others |
| ØE   | Investigate possibilities and practicalities (e.g. scope, financial implications, pros and cons, how best to communicate it at the ADHO level possibly in conjunction with GO::DH) of an EADH outreach event, where EADH invites representatives of actual and potential associate organisations and relevant groups for an open exchange |  |
| LI   | Circulate rankings of Small Grants Committee (2013 call) to respect deadline of notification to applicants (December 20)  
|      | Work together with PV and Small Grants Committee to envisage a better mechanism to enforce delivery reports from grantees.  
|      | Liaise with Small Grants Committee (2013 call) to  
|      |   ^ refine JR proposal on evaluation criteria for the next call  
<p>|      |   ^ create template and web form for application and reporting | Done |
| ML   | Liaise with EGB, CC and JR to draft a combined set of missions statements (e.g. welcome statement to EADH associate organisations that have decided to join us based on geographical proximity, inclusive yet defined cultural identity) and benefits package (e.g. common research avenues and publication venues) that outlines EADH take on the issues around ADHO associate organisations. (draft by mid Feb). | Done (2-pager) with contribution from others |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JCM</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with JN to draft a concise protocol regulating the formal relationships between EADH and CenterNet with respect to EADH expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss informally with CC how best to liaise with the upcoming Francophone association in the build up of their meeting in July 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate EADH position with respect to ADHO associate organisations models as projected by HS to feed ADHO SC upcoming strategic meeting (February 2014), indicating that: (1) the committee supports ADHO suggestion to introduce a membership only option at a rate to be defined (EADH expects some indication of a minimal fee with respect to this); (2) the committee would welcome also a more flexible approach to respond to the local and cultural needs of our potential associate organisations with the understanding that regional organisations would administrate their own membership and pass part of its income of membership through COs (in this case EADH) to ADHO (EADH would expect from ADHO 2-3 categories that would account for special needs and regions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify OUP OA issues as email exchange with the committee so that an answer about OA conditions can be presented to OUP at time of renewal of contract (see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check OUP contract in consultation with EV on the issue of digital archive/digital libraries subscriptions and inform OUP about renewal of contract (negotiations on ownership of LLC online archive and consequences for digital libraries if we ended the contract could be presented as a condition of renewal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with AC to establish a good mechanism to formalise committee email exchanges when votes are required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate contact between Peter Gietz and DB to liaise with OUP on flow of information issue (connected to DHd new memberships coming in).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JN</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with JCM to draft a concise protocol regulating the formal relationships between EADH and CenterNet with respect to EADH expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take the lead on drafting - in consultation with JCM and ML - a one page generic proposal (eventually to be made public on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
our website) addressed to both DHd and AIUCD as counteroffer which focuses on benefits of affiliation to EADH and through EADH to ADHO based on a per capita fee paid to EADH. Such proposal should include: a statement of intent to establish a structure of representation (e.g. advisory council to represent associate organisations within EADH governance) that would come into force by, e.g., July 2014 (so constitution can be amended if needed) and automatic EADH membership (by AIUCD conference, 11 December 2013). This should serve as flexible model for other organisations to join. The benefits package should have a mainly European focus (e.g. common access to European funding, coordinated networking; see also notes written by AC following EADH/AIUCD meeting, Oct 2013, in Agora; EADH as bridge between policy/funding level and regional level; see also ACH webpage for benefits)

| EO | Carried over from Ghent minutes: To lead initiative in recruiting an EADH newsletter editor. |
| JR | Re-issue call for Social Media Correspondents  
|    | Guide correspondents to improve image of EADH as European and multilingual association rather than British-based or mainly Anglo-centric  
|    | Liaise with EGB, CC and ML to draft a combined set of missions statements (e.g. welcome statement to EADH associate organisations that have decided to join us based on geographical proximity, inclusive yet defined cultural identity) and benefits package (e.g. common research avenues and publication venues) that outlines EADH take on the issues around ADHO associate organisations. (draft by mid Feb). |
| EV | Carried over from Lincoln minutes: Actions connected to name change and journal ISSN; proposal for a new format for the editorial board  
|    | As part of OUP contract renewal: explore if possible to |
renegotiate term for free access of journal issues to 6 rather than current 3 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Work together with LI and Small Grants Committee to envisage a better mechanism to enforce delivery reports from grantees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Model EADH substantial income without institutional members like libraries (new business model ready by meeting in Lausanne). Other associations and options could be used to build a 2-3 different scenarios to investigate what new financial models could be useful for our new set of substructures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>