

Direction & Oversight Committee Meeting Agenda & Minutes				
April 27, 2018, 2:00-4:00pm				
<p>Attendees: Ann Frenkel, Chair (UCR), Beth Dupuis (UCB), Felicia Poe (CDL), Peter Brantley (UCD), Michael Kim (UCSB), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Stephen Kiyoi (UCSF), Josh Hutchinson (LAUC-UCI), MacKenzie Smith (CoUL-UCD), John Renaud (UCI), Donald Barclay (UCM)</p> <p>Recorder: Danielle Westbrook</p> <p>Regrets: Todd Grappone (UCLA), Sarah Troy (UCSC)</p> <p>Guest(s): N/A</p> <p>Zoom: https://ucengage.zoom.us/j/8123706030</p> <p>Next meeting: May 25, 2018</p>				
Time		Lead	Notes, Decisions	Actions

10 min		AF	<p>DOC Housekeeping</p> <p>The DOC roster for 18/19 is almost set. Renaud will continue on DOC until the incoming UCI member is able to join (likely early Fall). Kiyoi will complete Kochi's term, and then UCSF will select a new member or Kiyoi will continue.</p>	<p>Action: Frenkel will forward the selection of Felicia Poe as the 18/19 DOC Vice Chair to CoUL.</p>
15 min		MS	<p>CoUL update</p> <p>CoUL is preparing a charge that will ask DOC to devise a plan for a UC Libraries digital preservation review. This will likely be ready for DOC in advance of the May DOC meeting.</p> <p>CoUL plans to discuss UCLAS work processes and communications in June.</p>	<p>Action: Frenkel will submit a letter/proposal to MacKenzie Smith or Steve Mandeville-Gamble about DOC's participation in setting the annual priorities.</p>
20 min		PB/DB	The Systemwide ILS (SILS) Investigation Report	<p>Action: DOC</p>

			<p>(draft) and the suggested governance structure for the SILS investigation moving forward.</p> <p>DOC members will have two opportunities to review the draft report before it is sent to CoUL (this is the first opportunity). Right now the SILS working group is looking for feedback on flow and content. In reviewing the draft report, DOC members can strategically consult with local experts. However, the working group asks that you do not circulate the draft more broadly.</p> <p>DOC members agreed that the presentation of campus survey data needs to be rethought; it's currently unclear what the SILS working group is trying to communicate. The group might opt for a simpler narrative description, and then include the data in an appendix.</p>	<p>members will review the draft report and governance structure, and submit feedback/edits directly in the google docs by May 03 end of day.</p>
20 min		PB	<p>Shared Fedora Working group report (draft).</p> <p>DOC recommended edits to the draft report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a DOC initiative, the recommendation should be for DOC to re-charge the group. - The opening paragraph should reference and paraphrase the charge; the statement about CoUL's desires is incorrect. - The timeline should be more specific, in terms of check-in points. - If the working group wishes to be recharged, they may want to include a draft charge in an appendix (i.e. offer the charge that you think will meet your goals). 	<p>Action: DOC members will continue their review of the draft report and send comments to Brantley.</p> <p>Action: Once the report has been revised, Brantley will bring a revised, final version for DOC to review at the May meeting.</p>
20 min		AF	<p>Evaluating the 24/7 Ask a Librarian service— Steering Committee recommends a charge to assess this service (draft).</p> <p>DOC recommended edits to the draft charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The time commitment listed is too high, and it's not necessary to include one. - The charge should include investigating potential alternatives, and/or if this should be a tier 2 service. 	<p>Action: Friedman will revise the charge and then work with the Ask a Librarian Manager and Digital Reference Shared Service Team to establish the roster.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the membership, four members is a recommendation. If the Digital Reference Shared Service Team thinks three team members will work, that's fine. - This assessment should in part help build a model/framework for assessing shared, distributed library services. <p>Decision: Friedman will serve as the DOC liaison.</p>	
5 min		FP	<p>"ARKs in the Open" - Update and call for interest</p> <p>Since 2001, CDL has served as the incubator for ARK (Archival Resource Key) infrastructure, consisting primarily of the specification for this persistent identifier, a registry of organizations using ARKs, and a global resolver service. To achieve long-term sustainability, the ARK infrastructure must emerge from CDL and mature in partnership with multiple organizations and community participants to guide its future. CDL is collaborating with DuraSpace on a pilot project called "ARKs in the Open" as a way of getting started.</p> <p>How can the UC campuses contribute? The pilot is limited in scope to basic community-building tasks. Step one right now: spread awareness; and identify interested UC members to serve on the ARK advisory group (potential opportunity).</p>	<p>Action: DOC members will review the update and DuraSpace FAQ, and they'll think about how campuses can get involved.</p> <p>Action: Poe will continue to update DOC.</p>
10 min		ST/JR	<p>Updates from SCLG and Shared Print groups</p> <p>N/A</p>	