

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

April 28, 2017, 2:30-4:00pm

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

Absent: Lorelei Tanji (CoUL), Beth Dupuis (after 3p)

Recorder: Sarah Troy (off-cycle, UCSC)

May recorder: Julia Kochi (UCSF)

Guests: Lena Zentall and Joe Ferrie (CDL)

Preparation Required by Attendees

- [FRSPT Final Report](#)

Duration	Lead	Activity	Notes/Decisions
30 min	CF	<p>Future of Resource Sharing Project Team Final Report - introduction and Q&A for 15 minutes with Lena Zentall and Joe Ferrie, then 15 minutes for DOC discussion</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>With so much flux in the product marketplace and no products that could meet our needs, the FRSPT did not ultimately select a suite of resource sharing products. We are currently working with VDX, a product that is not being actively developed and will eventually be replaced, and a CDL developed system.</p> <p>There has been a shift in the marketplace that does not favor our existing systems. Vendors are not interested in working with institutions to support patchwork systems. Instead, they want to provide a full-service integrated solution, which is the model other consortia are adopting when they move to systems like ExLibris Alma or Innovative's Sierra or OCLC's WMS. The market is bearing out what the SAG3 Shared ILS report predicted in 2014:</p>	<p>Action: Invite CM and EM to May meeting to talk about RLF group</p> <p>Action: Share FRSPT Phase 2 report with our ULs and discuss locally</p> <p>Action: Schedule off-cycle meeting to discuss this single topic,</p>

	<p>the UCs, as a system, are seeing increasing problems with our existing patchwork systems.</p> <p>The challenges we are experiencing directly relate to the broader challenges with our UC library management systems. Maintaining these separate systems comes with a high price tag in staff and system resources when you want to overlay them with system-wide services. The status quo means that just to maintain our current overlaid patchwork systems will require increasingly higher resource investments.</p> <p>The FRSPT is recommending as the optimal solution to move the UC libraries to a consortial ILS system (recommendation 1), which would open up new possibilities for collaboration among the UC campuses. The benefits go beyond resource sharing. Some of these consortial ILS products have reached maturity and have a robust academic customer base. Early adopter academic consortia have paved the way, so this would not be a risky move for the UCs. The RLF directors have added their support to this recommendation.</p> <p>If that recommendation is not excepted, then the team is making 4 recommendations. These are also meant to address what we do in the meantime, even if moving to a consortial ILS system:</p> <p>#2 Watch the marketplace (CDL and ILL community). This addresses the risk that OCLC may not provide an adequate replacement for VDX. We are not fully confident that the OCLC replacement product will meet our needs or how long we might wait for the new product to be developed.</p> <p>#3 Monitor development of key resource sharing products and investigate how our existing consortial borrowing system, Request, can be leveraged to work with those products (CDL) This mitigates risks that OCLC doesn't deliver or a campus moves to a different ILL product than VDX.</p>	<p>decide what we want to (ST will distribute a doodle poll)</p>
--	---	--

		<p>#4 Re-examine campus ILL workflows and refresh best practices, noting where we've adapted suboptimal processes to compensate for failings in VDX. (ILL community). This will be useful in preparation for any future migration.</p> <p>#5 Advocate for fixes or workarounds to serious known issues with VDX. (ILL community and senior UC management). Because VDX is no longer being developed (and hasn't been for several years now), advocacy at the highest level will be needed to persuade OCLC to put resources toward this work.</p> <p>Question: For those campuses currently in an RFP process, is it best to delay or move forward?</p> <p>Answer: Whatever system we choose we may need to create something to sit on top because of our specific needs.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>This report says foundational things about the ability of the UC system to continue with the business of resource sharing. This is an opportunity to develop a shared service around creating a product that meets our needs. What do we want discovery to look like (on the campuses and across the UC system)? Let's direct our resources to some coordinated and planned development. Could go with Alma, could go with Folio (https://www.folio.org/), which is component-based. With a product like Folio we could assist with development of architecture and create integration points that are flexible. Consider an integrated solution--how we would get there, how we would support it, and how we would fund it.</p>	
--	--	---	--

UCLAS Discussion

5 min	DB, LT	CoUL update and Debrief	
5 min	TG	DOC update	

Shared Plans & Priorities

15 min	AF, PB	<p>Shared Services Update Shared services have the potential to create efficiencies, CoUL interested in seeing 2-3 ideas for shared services (see the Systemwide Plans & Priorities)</p> <p>Ideas: Management of a shared ILS as a shared service</p> <p>Coordination of software development efforts (Hyrax)</p> <p>Identify skill set that should be a co-investment of at least a subset of the libraries, amplify our experience developing shared HR policies around staffing commitments</p> <p>Digital Preservation Standards</p> <p>Standardize agreements around cataloging—develop a scenario and make recommendations for consistent application</p>	<p>PB & TG: draft something related to shared software development</p> <p>AF & MK: draft standardized agreement for shared expertise related to cataloging</p>
10 min	FP	DAMS Report Discussion	Postpone to next call
5 min	DB	Update on Open Access Discussion SLASIAC meeting about support for the Academic Senate OA policy, CoUL determining best way to message	
5 min	BD, ST, TG	Round Robin Updates – 5 Min each. NRLF4, CKGs, DLF Style Meeting for UCs TG sending survey to gauge interest in DLF style meeting, will be distributed via CDL	TG reach out to Jayne Dickson
UCLAS Organizational Discussions			
5 min	All	DOC Leadership Transition Discussion	
Committee Logistics			
5 min	JR	SPST Reporting & Decision to Resolve Issue SPST will continue to report to DOC, DOC will routinize information sharing	will add SPST update to each DOC meeting
New Business			

