

**Direction & Oversight Committee
Meeting Agenda & Minutes**

August 26, 2016, 2:30-4:00pm
<https://zoom.us/j/4346138649>

Attendees: Beth Dupuis (UCB), Peter Brantley (UCD), John Renaud (UCI), Todd Grappone (UCLA, chair), Donald Barclay (UCM), Michael Kim (UCSB), Sarah Troy (UCSC), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Julia Kochi (UCSF), Lorelei Tanji (CoUL), Felicia Poe (CDL), Catherine Nelson (LAUC)

Absent: Ann Frenkel (UCR)
Recorder: Beth Dupuis (UCB)

Preparation Required by Attendees

- [FP notes from July 2016 DAMS meeting at Davis](#)

Durati on	Lea d	Activity	Notes/Decisions
UCLAS Updates			
10 min	DB, LT	<p>CoUL update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for design and engineering feasibility study for NRLF expansion was approved by UCOP. Next steps will be getting funding for construction. Jeff MacKie-Mason (UCB) and Ginny Steele (UCLA) are the two CoUL leads. • Updated UC Libraries' Systemwide Plan and Priorities in progress • Initiating an investigation of opportunities for shared services across the UC Libraries. Donald Barclay will be taking the lead in talking with each campus' DOC members. This is a fact-finding activity not a presumption that specific activities will be developed from this review; results will be shared with DOC. 	
5 min	TG	<p>DOC update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Todd Grappone was invited to participate in next CoUL meeting. 	
Shared Plans & Priorities			
45 min	FP	<p>Future of UC Systemwide DAMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOC charged UCL DAMS Project Team in March 2016 to investigate the current state of Fedora/Hydra and consider if UC Libraries should transition from Nuxeo technology to Fedora/Hydra. Charge includes examining functional and technical requirements as well as costs. Interim report with 	DOC subgroup (Brantley, Grappone, and Poe) will meet with DAMS Project Team chair Laura Smart

		<p>preliminary recommendations anticipated for September 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a July meeting held at UCD (Felicia Poe’s meeting notes https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/display/UC+Libraries+DAMS+Technology+Project+Home) the DAMS administrators who attended indicated interest in pursuing Fedora/Hydra and a shared development model. Though acknowledging the interest and enthusiasm for shared development, some DAMS Project Team members question whether the benefits outweigh the cost of a transition to a new technology stack. Importantly, do each of the UC campus libraries understand the significance of a transition to the Fedora/Hydra technology - the financial investment and organizational change – required, including the commitment of human resources and the reprioritization of existing local development efforts to support system-wide development goals? <p>DOC discussion / questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the resources required to transition to a Fedora shared platform be better spent elsewhere, e.g., maximizing discoverability of resources? Is Fedora a useful system-wide initiative compared to other potential initiatives? Can we unbundle the desire to explore a shared development model (i.e., collaborative technical development across ten campuses) from the Nuxeo/Fedora question and instead launch a project to investigate how a UC Libraries agile development program could be shaped and managed, and what type of resources would be required? Are we confident that Fedora can scale to meet UC system-wide needs? What would it take to run a UC Libraries agile development program, e.g., Which libraries would participate? Resources required? Managed by CDL? 	<p>(UCI) to articulate the new issues / questions raised and how the Project Team might address them in their report and recommendations.</p>
10 min	JR	<p>Brief prospectus Shared Print Strategy Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Shared Print Monographs experiment proposal from the Shared Print Strategy Team in order to gain real-world experience in concert with our HathiTrust program participation. In favor of learning how to assess and answer the core collections but recognize we do not have the answers now or that they will come easily. Collection analysis would be very valuable, though depends on what level of analysis we can 	<p>By next meeting: DOC members to read all associated documents, discuss the issues with your SCLG representative and UL, and come prepared to discuss. For</p>

		<p>do. Issues about number of copies suitable to retain is a very difficult research question (quality of copies, number of copies, can archival also be a service copy, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions needed: Review all background documentation and address the question of if a monograph shared print program is where we should place our effort, consider if/how your UC Library will participate, consider what questions are raised about what priority this is in terms of other projects, and where staffing resources would come • On a related note the Shared Content Leadership Group has raised questions about how they could be better engaged in the potential projects and priorities along these lines earlier and more iteratively than has been current practice. • Documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared Print Monographs: Research and experiments in preservation risk and inventory differentiation for distributed, shared print monograph collections • HathiTrust Shared Print Monographs Program Overview • HathiTrust Plan for Phase 1 Slideshow 	<p>example: a) if a monograph shared print program is where UC Libraries should place our effort, b) if/how your UC Library would want to participate, c) what additional information would help you reach a decision and/or endorse</p>
UCLAS Organizational Discussions			
10 min	DB	<p>Zoom webinars for system-wide communication? Interest in DOC communicating more across the UC Libraries so agreed to plan a couple webinars and open it to all UC Libraries. This might be something along the lines of a quarterly report on different topics</p>	<p>Donald Barclay will develop some ideas a proposal for an upcoming meeting</p>
10 min	TG	<p>Roles and Responsibilities for DOC Members A reminder to communicate to the library staff on your campus about the DOC activities and discussions to keep them informed.</p>	
Committee Logistics			
10 min	DB	<p>Procedures for changes in appointments on groups that report to DOC. Some groups have clear guidelines – such as LAUC – while other groups seem to manage more informally – such as SCLG. For informal groups -- such as CKGs -- it seems best to leave to that group. For formal groups, it seems useful for DOC to formally agree on a process. In cases with campus representation it seems fine to leave to the campus to suggest a new appointee; in cases with functional representation it seems best to come back to the committee to make further recommendations to DOC.</p>	<p>Catherine Friedman will develop a process proposal for an upcoming meeting</p>