

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

October 18, 2018, 10:00 – 4:00 pm

Location: Kaiser Building, Oakland (in-person)

**Attendees:** Sarah Troy, Chair (UCSC), Ann Frenkel (UCR), Beth Dupuis (UCB), Felicia Poe (CDL), Rice Majors (UCD), Josh Hutchinson (LAUC-UCI), Alison Regan (UCI), Donald Barclay (UCM), Todd Grappone (UCLA), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Stephen Kiyoi (UCSF), Michael Kim (UCSB), Steven Mandeville-Gamble (CoUL-UCR)

**Guests:** Sarah Houghton (CDL), Lena Zentall (CDL)

**Recorder:** Group effort (compiled by Danielle)

**Next meeting:** November 9, 2018 (2:00 – 3:00 pm)

Time	Lead	Notes, Decisions	Actions
10:00am-10:30am	ST	Welcome and warm-up	
10:30am-11:30am	FP	<p>The Movement toward a “UC Libraries” Identity</p> <p><b>Group 1:</b> Poe, Hutchinson, Regan            Focus (<a href="#">1</a>, <a href="#">2</a>, <a href="#">3</a>): Policy of the University of California on its Libraries (1962)</p> <p>Group members noted some tension around what’s being consolidated and where (both at the campus and systemwide levels, and in some instances between the campus and systemwide levels). Policies focused on improved library procedures, patron access, and collections (particularly around increasing collection sizes and expenditures).The group noted that community patrons are not mentioned, and policies around public services, particularly instruction and research, are also not present.</p> <p><b>Group 2:</b> Dupuis, Kiyoi, Majors  <a href="#">Focus:</a> Establishment of a UC digital library</p> <p>The group observed that most of the issues listed are still applicable today. While there was an assumption that coordinated efforts around technology would solve many library issues, they haven’t. Issues are never just technical; they’re also organizational, and rooted in how we mobilize (at the UC, and in the broader library/academic community). The group observed that open source technology isn’t mentioned.</p> <p><b>Group 3:</b> Friedman, Kim</p>	

		<p><a href="#">Focus</a>: Evolution of the UC Library into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</p> <p>The group found this document applicable to today – both in terms of <a href="#">the issues and strategies outlined</a>. The group mapped the 7 strategies identified in the report to DOC’s Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> agenda; these strategies are still being pursued 20 years later because the challenges faced by libraries are hard (they are wicked problems).</p> <p><b>Group 4:</b> Barclay, Grappone  <a href="#">Focus</a>: Establish strategic directions</p> <p>Group members noted that while the UC Libraries are still working on many of the work areas identified (shared collections, utilized shared facilities, shared services, persistent access to digital information), a lot has been accomplished in 15 years and our work is iterative. Group members reflected that the services and strategies outlined provide clearer paths for collections and technology, but not for public services. The document also discusses the formation of UCM.</p> <p><b>Group 5:</b> Frenkel, Troy, Westbrook  <a href="#">Focus</a>: Governance and framework of the UC Libraries</p> <p>Across the various governance documents, the group noticed key changes to the language used. Around systemwide efforts, at first there was a clear divide between campus libraries and systemwide/shared efforts (1970s), then there was a shift to more campus collaboration and sharing (1990s-2000s), and now we have a 10-library system and a UC Library Collection. The role of the university librarian has also evolved – from an operational role to one that’s more strategic and empowered. The role of external, systemwide governance also shifted from advisory to “working in concert” with the ULs. The UC Libraries Advisory Structure (UCLAS) has also moved from a heavier structure with a broad and somewhat ill-defined charge, to a lightweight structure that aims to be more strategic and focused. Group members remarked that the documents left them <a href="#">with several unanswered questions</a> that might benefit from further discussion on DOC.</p>	
11:30am-12:30pm	DB	<p><a href="#">HathiTrust holdings in Melvyl</a>;</p> <p><a href="#">SILS: State of the Project and the Role of DOC</a></p> <p><i>Guests: Sarah Houghton (Director, CDL Discovery &amp; Delivery) and Lena Zentall (Project Manager, CDL Discovery &amp; Delivery)</i></p> <p><b>HathiTrust</b>  CDL has already met with OCLC to discuss possible remedies for HathiTrust false positives (ebooks listed in Melvyl to which many of our campuses do not actually have access)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> DOC will discuss HathiTrust access (if a UC campus contributed a digital surrogate to HathiTrust, shouldn’t all</p>

		<p>and false negatives (ebooks in the public domain that are not listed in Melvyl as having digital, full-text access).</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> DOC approves a policy change (around the circumstances under which we show HathiTrust digitized books in Melvyl) to allow CDL, on UC's behalf, to work with OCLC to remedy the false positives issue; a policy change is not required to work with OCLC on the false negatives issue.</p> <p><b>SILS</b> DOC is the systemwide entity for charging project teams and proposing new/amended policy as needed (from DOC, or a DOC charged project team). Harmonization efforts will require such oversight and guidance. The Bibliographic Services Task Force (from an earlier era; it spawned the current version of Melvyl) may have written principles of harmonization that could be relevant.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Agreement with SILS representatives that DOC's role in SILS is to advise (the working group at key stages), advocate (to support cohort members, including the campus liaisons), and guide/manage harmonization (as the systemwide operational committee in charge of cross-campus communication and operations). DOC may also assist with communications (e.g. hosting a DOC brownbag).</p> <p><b>Campus visits</b> Houghton and Zentall are planning campus visits to discuss SILS and discover/delivery related topics. They'll follow up with each DOC member about scheduling these visits.</p>	<p>UC campuses have access to the HT copy via the catalog?).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Zentall will investigate whether DOC members should sign the SILS project NDA; she'll report back.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Zentall will share potential DOC brownbag webinar topics (related to SILS) and proposed dates.</p>
12:30pm-1:15pm		Lunch	
1:15pm-1:45pm	SMG	<p>Scholarly Publishing and Communication (issues around funding, sustainability, tenure and review dynamics)</p> <p>CoUL concluded that the libraries should not take the lead in conversations related to tenure and review. While librarians can partner with faculty to facilitate dialog in this area, this is more part of general OA education and building awareness.</p> <p>How can DOC support faculty in this area? How should the libraries build effective communications strategies regarding the major negotiations, and how do we identify our faculty advocates? Ideas generated by discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide info/data regarding quality of articles.</li> <li>- Use analysis and analytics to initiate conversations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action:</b> When the OSC journal flipping guide is ready, Westbrook (an OSC member) will share the document with DOC.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Engage with faculty who are editors or serve on journal boards; reach out to them for education, support, engagement and advocacy.</li> <li>- Faculty are concerned that all OA content is of poor quality – area for education/outreach.</li> <li>- Focus on discussing specific titles rather than packages or publishers.</li> <li>- The Office of Scholarly Communication is creating a “journal flipping” guide and other documentation.</li> </ul>	
1:45pm-2:15pm	Attendees	<p>OA forum recap</p> <p>Kiyoi, Majors and Barclay attended the Choosing Pathways to OA forum at UC Berkeley. The forum followed <a href="#">Chatham House Rule</a>, though some attributions were included (with permission) in <a href="#">the official forum summary</a>.</p> <p>There were 125 participants from more than 80 North American institutions. Conversations focused on “subscribe to open,” breaking big deals, faculty engagement, library-led OA publishing, and open infrastructure.</p>	
2:15pm-2:45pm	RM	<p>Digital Preservation Strategy Working Group—update</p> <p>Update from Edson Smith (chair): Due to a busy conference schedule, the DPS WG has met just once. The group reviewed and discussed the charge, some of the context behind it, and built a tentative schedule. Meetings will be weekly, with the immediate goal of agreeing on a set of best practices by the end of 2018. Interviews with individual campuses and exemplars will take place in January and February, with March reserved for writing and editing. The goal is to provide a complete report by April 1, 2019. The group agreed to work through existing standards documents (the various ISO’s and Core Trust) and start trying to find consensus on best practices there.</p> <p>DOC members noted that this item is related to the 18/19 plans and priorities, and so the major deliverable for this charge should be completed in a timely manner. DOC members confirmed that the charge is for an environmental scan, review of current practices, and identifying needs. Technical issues may be identified in a later phase. To better understand the CoUL perspective, the working group should extend an invitation for UL Erik Mitchell (CoUL liaison to the group) to attend pertinent meetings.</p>	
2:45pm-2:55pm	ST & CF	UC Libraries Materials Transportation RFP Project – update	<b>Action:</b> Friedman and

		<p>Since the last update [DOC meeting notes of September 14, 2018 <a href="https://app.box.com/file/319773335280">https://app.box.com/file/319773335280</a>]:</p> <p>The DOC members assigned to work on the project have drafted a charge for the Project Team (PT) that will be working on the RFP and have communicated regularly with the [expected] PT members. This will be shared soon with DOC.</p> <p>The [expected] PT has done the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Organized a Q&amp;A with UC Procurement to get clarification on their process and timeline.</li> <li>2. Worked on developing a requirements spreadsheet. The spreadsheet identifies the general information that will be needed from the key managers of the different types of materials to be transported so that the requirements can be developed.</li> <li>3. Identified the key managers of the different types of materials who will need to be consulted.</li> <li>4. Assigned member responsibility for gathering the information.</li> <li>5. Established the project timeline. The information from the key managers is needed by Monday, November 5, so that it can be revised and ready for DOC review by Friday, November 9. The requirements need to be submitted to UC Procurement by November 16.</li> </ol>	<p>Troy will bring the libraries' RFP requirements to the Nov. 9<sup>th</sup> DOC meeting.</p>
2:55pm – 3:00pm	ST	<p>Alternative Access Task Force</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> DOC will revise the Alternative Access Project Team charge to clarify the timeline and deliverables.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Regan will serve as Co-Chair. Frenkel will serve as DOC liaison.</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> DOC members have until Oct. 19 (end of day) to nominate project team members.</p>
3:00pm-4:00pm	ST & SK	<p>Finalize Plans and Priorities</p> <p>Discussion questions: Is the UCLAS structure working well in fostering the vision we want? Is the current model a bit too heavy on top-down approaches? What should be encouraged and empowered from the ground up? How can</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> DOC will further discuss and select an initial harmonization project</p>

	<p>we ensure that recommendations from working groups and project teams are actionable and acted upon?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DOC should consider its charge and how much time is allocated to CoUL-guided activities, to its various groups (e.g. project teams, shared service teams), and to DOC initiatives.</li> <li>- DOC should consider its bandwidth and priorities, as well as the system’s bandwidth and priorities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DOC may select a set number of yearly priorities (like three).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Individual members can facilitate conversations with their local leadership to gauge interest.</li> <li>- How do the libraries move something from a pilot/project to a systemwide initiative?</li> <li>- DOC’s role as harmonizer (for SILS) may be expanded more broadly; need clarity around harmonization goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pilot idea: materials on order without OCLC numbers.</li> <li>o Might consult with campuses that recently migrated their ILS to identify where we should focus harmonization efforts.</li> <li>o Consider how to document issues and what each campus is doing.</li> <li>o Consider how to handle multi-faceted issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Consider a UC-wide day to share best practices or other issues; perhaps related to UC DLFx?</li> <li>- DOC serves as an intentional connector between key projects (such as Linked Data tied to SILS).</li> <li>- How might the SILS principles/philosophy frame other systemwide work?</li> <li>- Within UCLAS, the role of CKGs is still an issue (what they can do and how well that’s understood).</li> <li>- Consider systemwide communication mechanisms (currently the User’s Council list).</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> DOC will be transparent about the committee’s work. Members will share DOC minutes/updates with their local leadership teams and staff more broadly.</p>	<p>(ideally a smaller, focused issue that is relevant to our current operations).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> DOC will discuss how to enhance UCLAS and address current frustrations.</p>
--	--	---