Direction & Oversight Committee In-Person Meeting
March 29, 2017, 10a-4p
Kaiser Center Tower, Oakland

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

Guest: Catherine Mitchell (CDL)

Welcome
Warm-up: Each DOC member shared an image of something that excites or inspires them related to higher education, scholarship, and/or academic libraries.

DOC Leadership Transition
Beginning July 1, 2017 Ann will be chair and Sarah will be vice-chair.

Academic Senate Open Access Policy / Symplectic
The UCs need to decide soon if we will invest another $300K in Symplectic Elements or pursue another approach to supporting the UC OA policy. This issue was presented at the last SLASIAC meeting and further information was requested by April 24. VP Carlson requested an ROI for Symplectic Elements though we do not have enough data to answer that explicitly. There is also interest in exploring other options in the CRIS ecosystem. DOC agreed on the approach to provide the data we can gather alone with context to help them evaluate the value of overall.

Catherine Mitchell, CDL director of access and publishing program and operations director for UC Office of Scholarly Communication, provided an overview of presentation she gave to SLASIAC:

Data:
1) Access to UC articles under the auspices of the OA Policy.
2) Testimonials – "why is it important that you were able to access this. (40-50 collected).
3) Early report showing where we were 1 year in, in September 2014.
4) Report in October 2015 showing what had changed.
5) Data that shows what we were collecting in terms of post-prints before the polices, during policy in place but manual only, then what happened when we launched publication management system. We have data through the first quarter of 2017. Trend is upward.

History:
1) Academic councils directive to make as convenient as possible for faculty.
2) Exploration of options for implementation
3) RFP process- with pilot campuses involved (Irvine, Los Angeles, San Francisco)
4) Selected Symplectic; now used by other institutions

Options:

    A. Commit to Sympletic for longer period of time

    B. Use form and manual deposit process mediated by campus libraries.

    C. Use form and manual deposit process unmediated by campus libraries.

The UC Academic Senate and UC leadership are jointly responsible for the decision about the UC OA approach and funding. There was an expectation that the UC approach would be reviewed in three years. These groups are looking to UC Libraries to provide data and a menu of options with consideration about three variables: speed, comprehensiveness, and cost. Donald will include the number of downloads with a focus on spreading the UC brand worldwide, and articulating the value of $300K spread across ten campuses. Questions remain about what group will provide the funding for Symplectic or another systemwide approach, and about the resources each campus is willing to commit if there is no longer a systemwide approach. UCOLASC meets in May and in the fall – the fall will be a tight timeline for the January 31 renewal date for Symplectic. We may need an alternate plan in case no decision is made by that date. As the implementer, CDL is considered a stakeholder rather than a neutral body so the report and recommendations are to come from DOC.

ACTION: Donald will draft a document with the presentation slides and data from Catherine Mitchell; Peter and Beth will draft a portion that captures our discussion about the broader goals that the policy was meant to support; as there is time, that document will be passed by DOC before being sent to SLASIAC and CoUL

Lunch Break

Shared Services
CoUL has charged DOC with developing specific actions related to shared services among the UC Libraries. DOC discussed possible assumptions/characteristics of shared services, brainstormed possible shared services/positions of interest to campuses, and outlined related issues for endorsement, evaluation, and design of the shared services.

Proposed Assumptions:

    1) A shared service does not need to involve all 10 campuses; can be just two campuses

    2) A shared service can be temporary or ongoing

    3) The exchange market can be in the form of dollars for service or barter of different services

Comments about the proposed assumptions:

Term: Shared service not necessarily persistent but shorter term partnerships may offer the benefit from evaluating the successes/lessons learned to inform other shared services in the future.

Selection: May use the decision-making rubric questions/prompts to make decisions about which small number we want to pilot now. Other possible criteria: potential for growth for the UC System, potential for adoption by more campuses, potential for improved services, potential for maximizing efficiencies.

Number of campuses: Some may only be two campuses as a pilot but around an issue that other campuses may be interested in staying aware of and acknowledge as having a systemwide benefit. Another range of services may happen at a higher level – especially if there are systemwide ramifications / resource implications then should be discussed by DOC first.

Evaluation: Useful to have the evaluation/assessment questions created at the outset that all shared services could use and each group would need not work out individually what elements to ask/study.

CoUL motivations: efficiencies (Next Gen projects), collaboration beyond technical services, awareness (of what is happening within System that may apply to own campus), growing from one campus to leverage services at a system-wide level

Scope: Useful to know what outstanding needs there are across institutions to see how might put various needs into one shared role (i.e. Python programmer)

DOC role: Don't want DOC to be an arbitrator for shared services or to take on a new (elaborate) approval process, though many thought it would be useful to include DOC in some way when there are broader ramifications for the system. Considered calling these "DOC sponsored" or "DOC registered" (perhaps the latter indicates more of an emphasis on coordination/communication outcomes rather than a formal approval role. Potential names for the register: DOC Exchange, Collaborative Project Exchange. Where do issues of unified strategies of implementation, shared requirements, and other coordination fit in? Does it matter if the issue is connected to a CoUL Strategic Direction/Project? What are the incentives to being a DOC-registered group? If DOC-sponsored, might require a higher level of documentation? Still shouldn't be heavy or super formalized or too time consuming? DOC sponsorship might be a forum for addressing individual campus needs that have not been successful in dealing with as two campuses.

Possible Shared Services

- Establish a co-development model
- Hydra-like expertise
- OA policy support
- DOC analyst (technologist)
- Digital preservation
- Digital forensics
- Shared consultancy
- Assessment expertise (including ARL statistics)
- Usability expertise – user interface and usability (technical)
- Space designer consultancy
- Instructional technology designer expertise
- Marketing expertise
- Shared digitization facilities
- Professional writer/publication assistance expertise
- Media curator to transition formats to digital

- Software carpentry (programming)
- HR and/or Business services options (though largely shared on campus than across campuses)

Consider each UC Library's strategic plan to see what the needs are

Consider where there are "centers of excellence" identified: expertise for own campus, have some capacity or given more resources could expand staff/space to be able to service with other campuses

Consider if centers of excellence and consultancy are connected in some way

Findings/lessons learned could be shared more broadly with libraries (not just report to DOC/CoUL).

Perhaps do an inventory to see how we have already partnered as a start and see what we have learned from those arrangements (such as shared cataloging).

Useful to have a UCnext.org type exchange for posting needs/seeing broader interests and matches

We may see patterns of sharing that we might institutionalize at a higher level.

Perhaps try a couple different types of projects/shared services such as new position, consultancy option, centers of excellence, short term projects, etc. Some are meta-collaborations and some are functional collaborations

What has succeeded and why have they succeeded:

- Shared funding (Chinese Cataloger)
- Shared coordination (Digital Reference)
- Deliverables are ongoing (cataloging, reference, etc)
- Consultant knows the community/network; can call on them as needed
- Elements of the product development cycle – determine deliverable, gain consensus of requirements, designated project manager and product owner to move through decision making processes, managing resources, ensure timelines met (esp critical if do software, to accept software development practices), ensure adopted/implemented

For Co-Development Model: (similar to work done with Melvyl and Nuxeo)

- Choose the project (such as DAMS Hydra)
- Figure out the scope/requirements (preservation/access/discovery/curated/etc)
- Designate responsible project manager and product owner with deadlines
- Designate resources needed (staffing/hardware/software/campus v cloud/consultants/testing and QA)
- Start the build process with formalized daily/weekly meeting schedule, process must be collaborative and cannot take too long
- Produce at least minimum viable product

ACTION: Donald, Peter, and Ann will sort through ideas proposed and suggest option(s) to DOC for pursuing one or more approaches. This might include a vote on the positions proposed to see which the various campuses have a need for now, a poll to create the proposed DOC registry of current collaborations/shared functions, a range of different types of shared service pilots (such as one position, one consultancy, one shared service with all campuses, etc)

DAMS Recommendations
We reviewed CoUL's response to DOC's five recommendations, including revisiting the one recommendation CoUL asked us to reconsider (Rec 4) and developing next steps for each.

Recommendation #1: Continue with Nuxeo
Campuses that have adopted Nuxeo will continue to be involved, and CDL will reach out to the other campuses not currently using Nuxeo to see if they now have interest to participate at least in future discussions. Some consideration is needed for how to weigh the input of the various groups (active users vs. potential users).

ACTION: Felicia will take the lead with this item.

Recommendation #2: Explore a collaborative development model
Our commitment is to explore this idea which can happen in a variety of ways. For example we can learn from other institutions that already do this. There was interest in engaging with an actual project/product to work on gain experience, but also need the infrastructure to do this. CDL does not need to drive this project - leadership could come from one or more campuses – but clarity is needed about how best to focus our energy and resources.

ACTION: See #4.

Recommendation #3: Establish a single contributor license agreement
All agreed this is useful and can address the issues CoUL raised.

ACTION: Felicia will take the lead with this item.

Recommendation #4: Participate in Hydra-in-a-Box project
CoUL asked DOC to revisit our decision and support this recommendation in some way. Historically UC Libraries have expressed interest in Fedora/Hydra and some are anxious to see this be pursued, though individual campuses are not necessarily in a position to dedicate the resources at this time. One campus volunteered a person to take the lead, though follow-ups with that person revealed potential confusion about the scope and nature of their role and of the type of project that different campuses might envision. We need to ensure we have the project management, product ownership, and developer roles all covered by people with those talents, and that we are in agreement about the desired end product.

Several campuses expressed interest in using this as an opportunity to act, rather than just study the issues theoretically. Several campuses are interested in pursuing the Fedora/Hydra direction, while other campuses are pursuing different open source options may be complementary depending on the

project definition and desired outcomes. Currently it is unclear what the UC Libraries collectively wish to gain from this experiment (shared sandbox approach, scalable product with multi-headed implementations, experience with co-development, potential for shared instance, etc). There is a question about whether the final product (made from shared development) will turn out to be a shared service in the end (that an individual campus would not have to run/tweak long term).

We need a clearer statement about what goals we are pursuing, what product we envision building, and how the activities of campus would fit together. There is support for a systemwide conversation between the technical people who are closest to this issue and those who have the right skills to help better formulate "what" they would propose as reasonable and valuable. This would likely be envisioned as a co-development project so this item is closely tied to Recommendation #2.

ACTION: DOC members will update their UL about our conversation, noting the complexities under consideration and our rationale for not simply choosing to endorse the recommendation.

ACTION: DOC Chair will reply formally to CoUL explaining the decision to call for the discussion and recommendation from the technical experts (described below).

ACTION: Todd and Peter will organize a discussion among the experts capable of developing our digital project infrastructure, providing them the background from the DAMS report and subsequent DOC and CoUL conversations and calling for their recommendation about the definition/parameters of a meaningful project/activity. This will include a representative from each of the UC Libraries and CDL who can help move the system to a common open source digital content platform. The recommendations will be submitted to DOC for further discussion and a formal reply to CoUL (potentially a charge).

Recommendation #5: Create a project team focused on linked data
ACTION: Felicia will take the lead in drafting a charge.

Future of Resource Sharing Project
Catherine reviewed the task force's report, noting there is an updated/revised version in the Box folder. No vendors offer options that meet UC Libraries' needs. All large academic libraries and consortia will have similar concerns, though those institutions that share the same ILS system will have an easier approach for developing APIs and building a comprehensive system for resource sharing. The FRSP Project Team recommends moving to a consortial ILS which aligns with some other systemwide projects and services. Some campuses are currently in RFP processes for their own ILSs so there is great urgency. DOC is greatly concerned that there are no commercial systems that allow us to continue to operate resource sharing activities as we have in the past. It was proposed that we use this report to think strategically about the technological environment that we are in and the next steps for the UC Libraries.

ACTION: DOC members will read the report and be prepared to discuss on the next DOC call.