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On April 28, 2015, library, archives, and museum leaders from around the United States gathered in Washington, D.C., to advance a vision of easy, seamless and reliable access for all Americans to the digital content and services that will enrich and improve their lives. The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) hosted the convening, and was joined by representatives from allied foundations, federal agencies, nonprofits, and service organizations that share the belief that smart, strategic investments around mutual priorities is key to making this vision a reality.

This vision has been decades in the making. Over the past two decades, a significant amount of digital library research and development has been conducted, primarily around local collections and through limited collaborations. As a result, the building blocks of a “national digital platform” – in which users, content, services, professionals, and providers will converge – already exist today. They exist in already digitized and born-digital content, collections, and linked data, in open source software projects and shared services provided by local, regional, and national organizations – and in the people using the content, working with services, and building the tools. Despite these advancements, the components remain diffuse and largely disconnected.

As our community becomes more engaged in an effort to connect disparate parts, so does IMLS. In 2014, the agency hosted its first national convening on the topic. The recommendations arising from that discussion encouraged IMLS to prioritize better connecting the most promising digital tools and services that have potential to scale. Toward that goal, a specific funding priority under the National Leadership Grant program was created to support development of the national digital platform. Proposals that are national in scope, build on demonstrated successes, work at scale, and leverage shared capacity and services were considered. Four awards meeting these criteria were made in early 2015, some in partnership with allied funders; and a second round of proposals are currently under review. These efforts are resonating within and beyond the library and museum community. For his 2016 budget request, President Obama included a targeted increase of nearly $9 million that would specifically support a national digital platform through the IMLS National Leadership Grant program.

As we gathered in Washington, D.C., this spring, our ambition was to work from this common vision and goal to take the next steps in our work together. We wanted to hear from all our stakeholders: What are our most pressing needs? Which results are most viable and most promising? How can professionals working in libraries, archives, and museums best contribute to and use the national digital platform to better meet the needs of their communities? What follows in this short report is an attempt to synthesize the key themes and issues raised by members of the library and archives community at this convening. Some of these are issues for which IMLS discretionary grants could provide funding to help catalyze work; many others would be better taken up by other funders, or as regional or local activities.

It is a great privilege to work together with our stakeholders on shaping America’s digital future. On behalf of all of us at IMLS, I’d like to personally thank each and every one who contributed to the convening at the Martin Luther King Jr. Public Library in person or via social media. We were inspired by your passion, your focus on user and community needs, and your commitment to collaboratively, iteratively working to improve a shared infrastructure. We’re committed to strengthening our efforts to work together towards a national digital platform that benefits all Americans.

Maura Marx
Acting Director, IMLS
The movement to advance a national digital platform that will provide access to digital content and services for all Americans has as its foundation more than twenty years of investment in a variety of digital initiatives from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and many other visionary partners. In response to the expectations of our users and the communities we serve, institutions at every level – local, state, and national – have contributed significant amounts of time, funding, and ingenuity to take the first steps needed to make access and interaction with digital content possible.

In the last three years, organizations like the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA), HathiTrust, and the Digital Preservation Network have made major strides in demonstrating that an interrelated set of activities forming a decentralized ecosystem can unite memory institutions in pursuing a shared strategy. During this period, IMLS developed a focused stream of National Leadership discretionary grants, hosted a convening on this topic in 2014, and announced four related grant awards in 2015.

Despite recent accomplishments, when key library, museum, and archives leaders met this April as a Forum on the National Digital Platform, an urgency suffused much of the conversation. Many attendees spoke of a need to better meet user and community needs, shift institutional priorities, and collaborate more meaningfully.

This document summarizes the highlights of the day’s conversations and distills recommendations from the discussions that took place at the forum. Some of these are specific recommendations to IMLS; many more are recommendations for priorities for libraries, archives, and museums to address. A full agenda and participant list from the gathering are included as appendices to this report.
DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF THE NATIONAL DIGITAL PLATFORM

Trevor Owens, IMLS Senior Library Program Officer, offered a definition of “national digital platform” that has both a broad and specific meaning. Broadly, this platform can be considered as all the digital tools, services, infrastructure, and people that institutions apply to meet the needs of all users. More specifically, it is a priority area in which IMLS, through its discretionary grant programs, will invest in expanding the digital capability and capacity of archives, libraries, and museums across the country.

I don’t think of the national digital platform as anything monolithic. … I think it’s about getting individual projects to think about not just themselves but how they fit into a wider sort of infrastructure, a wider environment, and how their materials can be best shared and preserved in sort of a national and international scale. – Brett Bobley, National Endowment for the Humanities

Forum participants energetically responded to this proposed definition; comments considered local versus national needs, the challenges and opportunities of consolidation and decentralization, and the resources required to move the work ahead.

HARNESSING LOCAL INITIATIVE FOR GREATER IMPACT

Amy Garmer, Director of the Aspen Institute Dialogue on Public Libraries, said that library roles are transforming from curating the world for the local community to curating the local community for the rest of the world.

Trevor Owens added that we cannot plan to have “one mega system,” and that there must always be “a research and development element to the work” that will explore different content types, ways of integrating, and making things more discoverable across the whole system.

Institutions were encouraged to identify how they can broaden what they do and “plug in” to the larger framework in some practical way. At the same time, as one attendee cautioned, we need to be careful not to “focus too much on national, and too little on platform.” An interoperable environment of tools, data, and services provided at a distance would allow local institutions to focus on what can be done locally. “Allow local institutions to do what they do best,” commented another participant.

What we’re dealing with here is more of a program or a portfolio of services, and of organizations that deliver and support those services. The magic here is how we make that portfolio reasonably comprehensive and, above all, coherent and cohesive, to allow these various services to complement each other. – Clifford Lynch, Coalition for Networked Information

Ultimately, the national digital platform will succeed ... if that platform allows local institutions to avoid the giant resource suck of digital services and tools, services and tools that could be better provided at a distance, and instead focus their resources, their energy, their staff expertise on the things that can only be done locally.

– Tom Scheinfeldt, University of Connecticut

THE USER AT THE CENTER

End users are creating, accessing, and organizing content in ways that were never before possible and, in many cases, without the support of a knowledge professional. The user should figure prominently in our strategy. How do we bring in their views, and identify the missing voices? We need to show value to the public and let our users drive change; they are ultimately our strongest advocates.
OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE AND CONNECT

Navigating through the emerging, complex digital content and service environment involves the ongoing consideration of many different policy issues, such as privacy, copyright, and licensing. Yet, there are many areas that are ripe for more immediate community action.

ENGAGING COMMUNITIES
The end users, and the communities they represent, are the beneficiaries of the national digital platform; they can also be contributors. In a digital service context, the lines between users and providers blur.

Much is happening now to work beyond the narrow boundaries of what institutions have been digitizing in the past to include unique, local content. Surfacing local content will “make a difference, on the ground, to the public, in a short period of time.” The D.C. Public Library’s role in archiving its local punk scene was suggested by one attendee as a “perfect model of the kind of interaction that a library can have with a community to really do something significant, reach people.”

Public libraries have a fabulous public library network, and every public library branch should make visible digitization and preservation. It should make visible to local public library users what is actually going on. – Sebastian Chan, Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum

We’re not necessarily good stewards of our own material, our own life in digital form, and I do think there are roles that public libraries can play in helping communities [to bring] personal material into the libraries and museums. I think there’s a lot of very interesting work about community life that can be brought forward. – Mike Furlough, HathiTrust

CHAMPION DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION
Significant portions of the conversation focused on diversity and inclusion in the national digital platform, acknowledging that this is both a challenge and a priority area. How can we ensure that content across distributed collections represents the diversity of the United States? How can we ensure that the national digital platform serves all Americans?

Another aspect is connecting the full range of small institutions, in a wide range of communities to national digital platform efforts.

How do we serve tribal archives, libraries, and museums, funneling their content in but having different concerns? How might we be aware of those? – Kimberly Christen Wilhey, Washington State University

CROWDSOURCING
One prominent approach to engaging digital users in a concrete, inclusive, and democratized way was described by Mary Flanagan of Dartmouth College, who used an IMLS National Forum award to form the Crowd Consortium and publish two national environmental scans aimed at libraries and archives. Flanagan found that, while libraries and archives are still wary of crowdsourced data and want to keep their existing institutional metadata pristine and separate, the project has generated significant interest and is driving new ways to engage the public.

Attendees acknowledged that institutional interests need to keep pace with public interest; once we pique awareness, we’re engaging “people who want to do something [because] they really care about this content.” Institutions need to be prepared to engage these users on a long arc. Some argued that we need to trade perfect data for maximizing knowledge at scale through true enthusiasts and knowledge communities. Some attendees wondered why more professionals are not widely participating as users in “metadata mob”-type activities that engage the public in creating and assigning metadata. With the scale of our work, we cannot do it ourselves. Why not democratize archives through community participation?

ENABLING TECHNOLOGY
Throughout the day’s discussions, several enabling technologies emerged as key community priorities.

I think from a national digital platform perspective, one of the things that this group might do is … drive the identification and adoption of those tools and really get more people playing. – Tom Cramer, Stanford University
The technology to create media [is] moving faster than the technology to manage and store it. – Karen Cariani, WGBH Educational Foundation

**Linked data.** A number of participants noted that linked open data can connect content on the platform in new ways as well as provide connections between environments; it is one way to link DPLA to Europeana, for example. This requires a shift in thinking about metadata as human-readable records to thinking about it as machine-readable entities. The move from a web of interlinked documents to a web of interlinked data has huge potential to amplify the impact of the work of libraries and archives. However, Jon Voss from Historypin cautioned that linked data is not something that can simply be bolted onto existing tools, practices and data; standards and shared protocols are needed to make it work, as well as fundamental work to rethink processes and workflows. The value is only realized when other resources are made openly available as linked data. In a way, it’s more about policy than technology. In order to scale practice, we need simple tools and a broad understanding of the value of linked data.

The environment and the culture of linked open data sees the web less as a traditional publishing platform … and more as a living interoperable network that provides new and entirely different ways of engaging and collaborating with communities. – Jon Voss, Historypin

**Computational solutions.** Anne Wootton from Pop Up Archive gave examples where fundamental improvements in computational capacity are increasing accessibility: automatically generated transcripts, voice recognition and command, and semantic analysis of audio and speech. A combination of automated and human approaches can be useful. Emerging technologies make these solutions possible, but we need to move that technology from individually funded projects and make it accessible via the platform.

**Interoperability.** Perhaps the most important aspect of the platform is interoperability. Because local projects create individual units of work, funding agencies must support the development of the connective fiber by requiring modularization and interoperability, ensuring that the whole becomes more than a sum of the parts.

Interoperability is number one on my wish list. I think IMLS could lead the way in bringing together the organizations in order to learn about each other, foster collaboration and innovation and discuss the next step in bringing these systems more in sync. – Sibyl Schaefer, University of California, San Diego

The connections between tools and services are where the most challenges are, and where the most time is spent.

If I had a wish or a plea, it would be for us to work on tools … that are doing ingest and preservation and dissemination and management, and to make those tools not only interoperate, but to make them so easy to use that we can [give] power to the people. – Vicky Reich, Stanford University Libraries

Of course, a primary factor that allows scale and supports sustainability is interoperability.

Interoperability … is our clearest path to a sustainable cultural heritage and public information infrastructure. Whether that interoperability is about federated search and discovery, or linked open data, or open source software, or consortial revenue models … building the national digital platform is ultimately about sustaining local investments. – Tom Scheinfeldt, University of Connecticut

Throughout discussion, participants stressed the importance of open source software. Several participants emphasized the need for engagement beyond simply making source code available, including supporting the development of user communities, creating adequate documentation, and cultivating relationships between developers working in libraries around the country. As that work moves forward, it is essential that those communities and systems work toward interoperability and integration.

With the intention to make complex tools accessible to others, IMLS recently funded an initiative from Stanford University, DPLA, and DuraSpace to create Hydra-in-a-Box, a next-generation, open source, digital repository. Adapting existing tools for easier implementation is an efficient way to accelerate the development of, and expand participation in, the national digital platform. Offering hosted services is another way to involve more institutions. The outcomes of the Hydra-in-a-Box project will serve as a significant part of the framework for the national digital platform.

If you think it's simple, make it even simpler. – Karen Cariani, WGBH Educational Foundation

Another way to reduce barriers to participation is to offer services rather than tools. By providing services that work together in a cohesive way, including hosting, validation, authentication, and harvesting, smaller institutions can bypass many information technology requirements.

**RADICAL AND SYSTEMIC COLLABORATION**

Radical collaboration to support the national digital platform emerged as a priority for libraries, archives, museums, and allied institutions. IMLS and others will need to work effectively and simultaneously with local institutions, with state and national service providers, and with global initiatives. Collaborations must then be bound together, forming a mutually reinforcing environment that provides support for core, centralized functions yet allows for innovative, decentralized breakthroughs at the boundaries.

**Local: Break down internal silos.** Jon Voss asked those who were not library, archives, and museum (LAM) professionals,
“How hard has it been for you to work with LAMs?” Attendees shared challenges they had faced in working with LAM institutions. One called her collaboration “tough and frustrating.” Mary Flanagan noted that she when starting her Crowd Consortium project, she was advised to “stay away from the library and the archive for a while; that way you can think outside of it.” In retrospect, she noted that it had been helpful; although there was strong interest, many LAM institutions she engaged with seemed “overwhelmed with trying something new.”

We’ve got a lot of capabilities that are parked inside of institutions but that we don’t reuse well as a community because people can’t find them or they’re not set up to provide services to others, so there’s a great deal of replication that seems to happen, and I think part of the strategy is to build on expertise rather than attempt to replicate it all over the place, because it’s just too expensive. – Clifford Lynch, Coalition for Networked Information

We have to keep in mind that most of these organizations that we’re talking about potentially funding really exist as many, many, many silos within those organizations. If we can’t break those down, how are we going to break down these regional and national silos? – Kara Van Malssen, AVPreserve

National: Provide leadership to advance and connect. The role of national service providers and member associations was discussed: Where are the gaps in our distributed national capacity? Are they related to infrastructure, or relationships? What can, or should, state and national organizations be doing to advance the work that has been started?

Brett Bobley, CIO and Director of the Office of Digital Humanities at the National Endowment for the Humanities, praised IMLS for taking the steps suggested at the 2014 forum, and he commended the other funding institutions in the room for contributions thus far; however, he also urged funders to do a better job of working together to build a unified platform. While these and other investments have made significant and lasting advances, the impact remains far more diffuse than it could be.

A number of attendees made the case that national organizations can also advocate more strongly for urgent preservation needs. Others felt that institutions should develop their own funding strategies to cover this work at local and regional levels. Federal funding is increasingly being used to catalyze and help shift local investments to ensure broader impact.

We expect so much of our funding agencies, but it’s also up to us as leaders of organizations to transform them and not just keep adding on activities, but thinking a little bit about what our users actually need and …what our priorities should be now. If digitization of our collections is a huge priority for our communities or user groups, we should be finding ways to make that a priority for our operations and not think that we’ll always have to go find new money. We have to rethink the way we do our jobs. – Deanna Marcum, Ithaka S+R

Another attendee praised DPLA’s hub model, where geographic regions feed into a national effort. This could be a model for a range of issues in the life cycle of different kinds of content and in providing services.

International: Envision a global platform. Attendees raised the point that distributed national capacity has been the primary focus thus far, and that it may be time to consider how we may
connect and interoperate with international infrastructures and developments. Can we envision the national platform participating and connecting out to a broader global digital platform, one that is far more diverse than the U.S.-centric version we have been discussing?

Some attendees countered that this “broader conversation needs translators.” Despite differences in languages and policies, a key to connecting globally is to make the platform components universally easy to use, to assure interoperability and applicability beyond a national environment.

Global leadership – how we’re going to knit together these various initiatives… Europeana is easy, but how do we deal with the developing worlds, and really begin to address those questions? – Jim Neal, Columbia University

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As libraries and archives increasingly move to using open source tools and software, it becomes even more critical to invest in developing library and archives professionals who can use, deploy, contribute to, and support those tools. There is a broad need to improve all librarians’ and archivists’ computational literacy. At the same time, there is a particular need to develop a cadre of library and archives software developers, engineers and digital project managers who can contribute to the core development, management, and direction of software and services.

The first thing that should come into many institutions is not another technology component that you have to support, but rather a functioning social conjugate to a broader culture that understands digital library workers and that values the various communities that they inhabit and intersect with, and are inspired by. The continuous renewal and expansion of expert practitioner communities is our most fundamental sustainability issue. It’s the one on which all the others depends. – Bethany Nowviskie, Council on Library and Information Resources

Kim Schroeder, from Wayne State University, asked the audience what skills they would like new employees to have. The wide range of answers included effective reference skills, programming acuity, project management skills, and an entrepreneurial spirit. She opined that while we have 120 years of professional education behind us, we need more discussion, needs assessment, and a national drive to address those needs. Three themes related to professional development emerged: continuous learning, cross-training, and hands-on practice in library and other degreed programs.

Continuous learning. Advances in technology are requiring continuous archives, libraries, and museum and training in digital competencies and skills for archives, libraries, and museum professionals.

The national digital platform requires change at the local level. Michael Edson, a digital strategist at the Smithsonian Institution, added that the accelerated pace of change will be with us for a very long time, so we need to train managers and leaders to adapt to the change – or, in some cases, get out of the way.

Bethany Nowviskie, from the Council on Library and Information Resources, shared her experience with allowing staff to spend twenty percent of their time on innovation that connects to the mission and has visible outcomes. She mused about the possible impact of all U.S. libraries providing time for staff to be creative about public-spirited projects. Nowviskie also suggested that grant-funded projects should be required to have professional development outcomes. The value derived from these projects could positively impact staff and leadership for years to come.

Cultivating a digital library workforce. Much of what libraries do should be collaborative, involving multiple disciplines and many types of skills. Most librarians do not have a technical degree, but they learn from the technologists with whom they work. Sibyl Schaefer, from the University of California, San Diego, noted that this can be a challenge for smaller institutions where, lacking funds for a full-time developer, staff with the necessary background in library or archival studies are asked to pick up technical skills along the way. Documentation helps, but does not address all technical training needs.

The need for cross-training goes well beyond technology, to include business skills such as budget proficiency, project management, and needs assessment. While there’s an expanding set of skills to impart to librarians, archivists, and museum professionals, basic library concepts should also be taught to those from other disciplines. Entrepreneurial approaches to creating alternative modes of training, such as certificate and online programs in digital curation and other subjects, might help us embrace others from outside the field as “legitimate” workers.

Supporting professional development has a multiplier effect on the value of all the platforms that you invest in, and enabling the people who create and use and teach your platforms to think critically about the intersection of society and technology makes the technology more inclusive and valuable. – Andromeda Yelton, Small Beautiful Useful, LLC

The importance of hands-on practice in degreed programs. Engaging directly in practice should be included in library, archives, and museum education. Some commenters felt that every class needs to include hands-on projects that allow students to gain people skills, professionalism, and jobs. At a few universities, graduate students receive fellowships to join a cohort comprising different disciplines, and together they design, build, and launch a technical project over the course of a year.

Margo Padilla from the New York Metropolitan Library Council described the National Digital Stewardship Residency program, which has been funded by a series of IMLS Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program grants
to organizations providing opportunities to residents. This program provides a bridge for students coming out of graduate programs by giving them immersive hands-on work that contributes to programs at participating institutions. This model allows residents to share skills and connections with current and former residents; and it anchors them as new professionals, helping them feel invested and committed.

_Educating librarians to meet the needs of libraries and archives._ Archivist of the United States David Ferriero closed the convening by drawing attention to the need for library education programs to focus on equipping future librarians and archivists with the skills sought by library and archives employers. It is critical for educators to better understand the current and future staffing needs of libraries and archives, and to focus on retooling education programs to equip students with the skills necessary for success in the 21st century library, archives and museum workforce. He particularly stressed the importance of further movement towards the common needs of cultural heritage institutions, as opposed to fragmented approaches that focus on the differences between institutions. A key element in this area is a shift in mindset to broadly meet the needs of users and engage with a range of communities.
ENHANCE AND BUILD INTEROPERABLE TOOLS AND SERVICES.

Make services and tools easy to use for contributors and other users. Give preference to tools and services that enable batch processing. Support developments for incorporating crowdsourced data. Provide application programming interfaces (APIs) to allow integration with existing systems, and to encourage contributions by third-party developers. Advance work on linked data and computational solutions. Support projects like Hydra-in-a-Box that provide key components of the national digital platform and enable easy participation. Identify, improve, and connect the tools and services with the most potential.

BE INCLUSIVE.

Welcome contributions from all types of cultural institutions. Foster collaborations to create pathways for smaller institutions to participate in the national digital platform. Mobilize a diverse range of end users as active participants across all areas of digital content and services. Include all voices, in particular underserved and underrepresented populations.

INITIATE RADICAL COLLABORATIONS.

Unite the efforts of local, regional and national organizations around common objectives. Partner with federal and state agencies, including State Library administrative agencies. Coordinate across funding bodies to generate support for the advancements needed to significantly improve the national digital platform and avoid funding silos. Apply criteria to determine if projects fit in the national landscape, and transition them from their local silos to the national platform. Keep in mind the ultimate goal of connecting internationally.

SHIFT TO CONTINUOUS PROFESSIONAL LEARNING.

Advances in technology require continuous learning and training. Include hands-on activities as part of degreed program coursework. Foster cohorts of recent graduates in tracks toward leadership roles. Facilitate on-the-job innovation and learning time. Encourage cross-training. Emphasize need for documentation and professional development to enable others to implement or replicate project outcomes.

After more than twenty years of individual digital projects, small collaborations, and some incremental advancement, the time for radical, systemic collaboration has finally arrived. Working together, we can create a platform upon which we can build our collective future.

Top Left: National Digital Platform Forum attendees
Top Right: Mary Minow, National Museum & Library Services Board Member Bottom: (from left) Clifford Lynch, Coalition for Networked Information; Mike Furlough, HathiTrust; and Sebastian Chan, Smithsonian Design Museum

Readers can view each panel and discussion session of the IMLS focus meeting on the national digital platform at www.imls.gov/news/imls_focus.aspx; you can also follow or join the conversation on Twitter using the hashtag #IMLSfocus.
9:00 A.M. – 9:20 A.M.
Welcome and Opening Remarks
• Speaker: Richard Reyes-Gavilan, Executive Director, DC Public Library
• Introduced by: Maura Marx, Acting Director, IMLS

9:20 A.M. – 10:00 A.M.
Defining and Funding the National Digital Platform
• Moderator: Trevor Owens, Senior Program Officer, IMLS
• Panelists:
  Brett Bobley, Chief Information Officer, National Endowment for the Humanities
  Amy Garmer, Director, Aspen Institute Dialogue on Public Libraries
  James G. Neal, University Librarian Emeritus, Columbia University

10:00 A.M. – 11:10 A.M.
The State of Distributed National Capacity
• Moderator: Tom Scheinfeldt, Associate Professor, University of Connecticut
• Panelists:
  Dan Cohen, Executive Director, Digital Public Library of America
  Evelyn McLellan, President, Artefactual Systems Inc.
  Sibyl Schaefer, Digital Preservation Analyst, University of California, San Diego
  James Shulman, President, ARTstor

11:10 A.M. – 11:25 A.M.
Break

11:25 A.M. – 12:35 P.M.
Gaps in Distributed National Digital Capacity
• Moderator: Katherine Skinner, Executive Director, Educopia Institute
• Panelists:
  Karen Cariani, Director, WGBH Media Library and Archives, WGBH Educational Foundation
  Sebastian Chan, Director, Digital & Emerging Technologies, Cooper-Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum
  Mike Furlough, Executive Director, HathiTrust
  Clifford Lynch, Executive Director, Coalition for Networked Information

12:35 P.M. – 1:35 P.M.
Working Lunch

1:00 P.M. – 1:20 P.M.
Focus on eBooks
• Speakers:
  Micah May, Director of Business Development, New York Public Library
  Mary Minow, National Museum & Library Services Board Member
1:35 P.M. – 2:45 P.M.
Scaling up Practice
• Moderator: Deanna Marcum, Managing Director, Ithaka S+R
• Panelists:
  Mary Flanagan, Professor, Dartmouth College
  Trevor Muñoz, Assistant Dean, University of Maryland Libraries
  Jon Voss, Director, Strategic Partnerships, Historypin
  Anne Wootton, CEO, Pop Up Archive

2:45 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.
Break

3:00 P.M. – 4:10 P.M.
Cultivating Digital Library Professionals
• Moderator:
  John Palfrey, President, Board of Directors, Digital Public Library of America
• Panelists:
  Andromeda Yelton, Owner, Small Beautiful Useful, LLC
  Bethany Nowviskie, Director, Digital Library Federation, Council on Library and Information Resources
  Kim Schroeder, Lecturer, Wayne State University
  Margo Padilla, Strategic Programs Manager, Metropolitan New York Library Council

4:10 P.M. – 4:20 P.M.
Going Forward
  David Ferriero, Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration

4:20 P.M. – 4:30 P.M.
Closing Remarks
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