

**Digital Initiatives Steering Committee**  
**June 4, 2008**

*Members present:* Beth Black, Wes Boomgaarden, Tom Cetwinski, Nena Couch, Yossi Galron, Amy McCrory, Sarah Murphy, Dan Noonan, Nancy O’Hanlon, Sally Rogers, Mary Scott, Beth Whittaker

*Guest (for part of meeting):* Ruth Gallegos Samuels

**1. CIC E-science conference.**

Dan reported on this conference, which several people from OSUL attended. It was a very heavy schedule. He particularly enjoyed the “small science” speakers – it seems like there is really a role for librarians to play. “Curation” means something else to scientists than it does for librarians and archivists. They think it means manipulating or changing their data. “Data management” or “data stewardship” might be less threatening terms. Value-added interpretations are how they understand “curation” and not what they are interested in seeing librarians do to/for their data. He will look to see if information about presentations is available online and if there’s anything of interest to DISC. (There was a wide variety of presentations.)

**2. Audio & Moving Image Standards**

Dan discussed the “Digital Audio Preservation Format Report,” which was emailed to the group and is also available on the J: drive. He envisions that we would create brief statements that would outline levels of preservation specifications. Existing project documentation has already laid these out at other institutions as well as possible tools for evaluating and inputting/outputting sound files for preservation. (?)

This report is most of the work that needs to be done to create our internal documentation for users/vendors. It will be on the web (and printable) in a similar format to the documentation on image preservation created by Amy. (She will add elements of Dan’s document to hers, as well.) Some resources exist to digitize audio files (at TRI and on campus) but there are many options.

File size is a HUGE concern because they will take up lots of space. There are concerns about just digitizing smaller files (to preserve content of archaic technologies, for example) in addition to preservation of large files that “merit” highest sample rates/bit depths/etc. Source data determines (to a large extent) the quality that is available no matter how high the standards.

There are perhaps two different needs: 1) on demand in-house digitization for researchers 2) large projects/collections that may be sent out (particularly for at-risk materials.) These may not be two separate approaches, though. Equipment, software, and expertise are all parts of this approach. Presentation of audio is another part of this, which will depend

largely on our local environment. Openness of the formats is unclear – the big ones are proprietary.

Another part of the documentation needs to be questions that people should ask and how to contact experts, since there are so many factors that go into these decisions. It is hard to make blanket recommendations.

Next steps: This content will be presented in Beth's July presentation on the digital project web site. Dan will revisit moving image standards for the November DISC meeting.

### **3. DRMC update**

Nena is working with Kyle Kaliebe and Melanie Schlosser to create one report, which she will circulate as soon as it's complete. On the wiki, there is a list of features that are desired. Panning/zooming technology is being tested. Best practices subcommittee decided to look at minimum standards.

### **4. Dare project**

Project content has been delivered to OhioLINK and will be submitted into DRC (rather than DMC.) Pan and zoom technology needs to be resolved before project is complete. Each institution's DRC will be branded as they desire. Nena recommends DISC take a look at the instances that are already available.

### **5. Proposed methodology for service gap analysis and creation of joint Assessment/DISC subcommittee**

Ruth presented "Some preliminaries for an assessment framework for DISC initiatives" which is an initial attempt to develop an assessment mechanism, based on interviews and meetings she's had so far. Her presentation will be placed on the committee website.

Reliable measures are needed for assessment, particularly:

*What areas need to be assessed?* (initiatives and projects, strategy, workflows, quality enhancements and standards)

*General criteria of assessment* (provision of services, use of services, costs/resources/ quality of services)

*What measures?* (dimensions/outputs for: efficiency, cost effectiveness, market penetration, quality and impact)

Proposals: Focusing on Impact Measurement and Clearly Articulated Institutional Goals

Discussion: it will be very complex to measure the impact of our digital initiatives. We need to tie into our institutional goals as a research institution, thinking long-term and having a broad audience. The model of evaluating knowledge/affect/skills/attitude is

often a desired assessment from grantors. This may be difficult to measure for external users.

Workflow needs to include contacts and follow-up. Our performance in this area may be affecting “return business,” but it is difficult to say if we need more tools or strategies since we have not determined what our goals are.

Determining our institutional goals (OSUL and OSU) needs to be done so we can tie our digital initiatives into this, as well as identifying our long-term goals as a research institution (independent of current “trendy” goals.) This is a good time to look at this given the planning task forces that are going to work throughout the summer. Since they are moving so quickly, we can feed the results of that into our identification of goals for DISC.

Next steps: Ruth will continue to look at how to measure impact. Many DISC members are engaged in library task forces so this will be fed into our goals identification, after that process is complete. Beth B. will put the presentation on the web site.

## **6. Other**

Sarah told the group she should hear about the proposal with the Columbus Museum of Art in September. She has also worked on a proposed LSTA grant for using Vocera technology for communicating with library staff (especially in large library locations.) This will be announced in October.