

**Direction & Oversight Committee (DOC)
Meeting Agenda & Minutes**

June 22, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm

Attendees: Ann Frenkel, Chair (UCR), Beth Dupuis (UCB), Felicia Poe (CDL), Rice Majors (UCD), Josh Hutchinson (LAUC-UCI), John Renaud and Alison Regan (UCI), Donald Barclay (UCM), Todd Grappone (UCLA), Sarah Troy (UCSC)

Recorder: Danielle Westbrook

Regrets: Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Stephen Kiyoi (UCSF), MacKenzie Smith (CoUL-UCD), Michael Kim (UCSB)

Guest(s): N/A

Zoom: <https://ucrengage.zoom.us/j/8123706030>

Next meeting: July 27, 2018 (2:00 – 4:00 pm)

Time	Lead	Notes, Decisions	Actions
10 min	AF/ST	DOC Housekeeping Decision: While DOC decides whether to move to a one-hour biweekly meeting, the schedule will stay as-is for July.	Action: Troy will poll DOC members, re: the 18/19 meeting time(s) and frequency.
15 min	AF/ST/FP	Report from DOC steering committee meeting with CoUL (slide deck presented in the meeting) CoUL endorsed DOC's proposal for the DOC Chair to join CoUL meetings moving forward. CoUL and DOC agreed to a one-year pilot, where the DOC chair is a non-voting member who participates in discussions. CoUL is still discussing DOC's proposal to change SCLG's reporting line (from DOC to CoUL). CoUL confirmed that they expect DOC will continue to work on important systemwide work/projects, even if it falls outside of the plans and priorities. Priorities and operational work need to be balanced.	Action: Once the 18/19 plans and priorities are finalized, DOC will develop a roadmap for the year (largely based on the plans/priorities).

10 min	AF and all	<p>Review of 18/19 plans and priorities</p> <p>Decision: Hold this agenda item until DOC has the revised 18/19 plans and priorities document (likely in time for the July 27th meeting).</p>	
10 min	DW	<p>CoUL update</p> <p>At the June CoUL meeting, SCLG, the Offsetting Task Force, and the Publisher Agreements Task Force all gave updates.</p> <p>CoUL unanimously endorsed the systemwide ILS phase 2 report and recommendations. Phase 3 will start in July.</p> <p>Having earlier endorsed the Choosing Pathways to OA Forum, CoUL reviewed the forum budget and endorsed co-funding the forum with UC Berkeley.</p> <p><i>*See agenda items 2 and 5-6 for more information about additional topics discussed at CoUL.*</i></p>	
10 min	DB	<p>Systemwide ILS (SILS) update/next steps</p> <p>DOC will be asked to help staff the various expertise groups and to help identify the campus liaisons. The SILS working group is preparing an information booklet and tool (survey) to help facilitate this process.</p> <p>A DOC member noted that phase 3 of the SILS project will need to include trust-building and finding balance around policy/procedure harmonization.</p>	
15 min	FP/TG	<p>Digital Preservation Charge next steps</p> <p>To support a discussion between CoUL and DOC about the digital preservation charge at the June 15th meeting, a DOC subgroup (Grappone, Hutchison, Majors, and Poe) began adjusting the scope and parameters of the charge.</p> <p>CoUL edits to the digital preservation charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include a more specific output (e.g. writing a report akin to the Pathways document). - Include plans for future phases of work and potential goals. 	<p>Action: Poe and Westbrook will draft a new digital preservation charge (to distribute to DOC for review on the listserv).</p>

		<p>CoUL feedback that DOC might keep in mind when rewriting the digital preservation charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This initial phase of work should be kept at the “30,000 foot” level and scoped to a six month timeline. - Consider including an initial evaluation of current policies (e.g. selection, evaluation), processes, and systems. - Consider speaking to the data that’s currently curated by the libraries and might be curated in the future (e.g. containers vs. code). - Consider how the libraries might engage with other campus partners (i.e. to consider in phase 1, and carry out in a future phase). - Consider how/when to survey organizations that the libraries might work with and the potential impact on the content types curated. <p>CoUL does not need to see this charge again before DOC moves forward.</p> <p>Several DOC members noted that the charge will require expertise not on DOC; in revising and reviewing the charge, DOC members will have a better idea of how big the group should be and the kinds of expertise needed.</p>	
5 min	AF/DB	<p>SCLG Request</p> <p>SCLG has submitted recommendations to DOC about tracking and sharing CKG membership. SCLG has had difficulty in the past identifying the appropriate CKG chair and/or CKG roster.</p>	<p>Action: Barclay will respond to SCLG Chair Scott and direct SCLG to the CKG page on the UC Libraries website, which lists the CKG chairs (last updated earlier in June 2018). Barclay will also let Chair Scott know that each CKG maintains its own roster.</p> <p>Action: In the annual DOC message to CKGs, Barclay will continue to ask that members keep their membership lists and listservs up-to-date. In future, when there’s an applicable project that requires CKG input,</p>

			Barclay will email the CKG chairs and remind them to keep their roster/listservs up-to-date.
5 min	RM	Request from Data Curation CKG to survey librarians/library staff on data management expertise Decision: DOC supports the Data Curation CKG's survey request.	Action: Majors will let the Data Curation CKG know that DOC endorses their survey and asks that the CKG make their findings available afterwards (e.g. a public report).
5 min	AF	Update from Digital Reference Shared Service Team The statewide academic reference coordinators sent a letter to the OCLC QuestionPoint staff identifying several concerns.	Action: Troy will share the statewide reference coordinators' letter with CoUL. Troy will include an update on UC's assessment of the 24/7 (i.e. QuestionPoint) service.