

DISC Minutes
3 December 2008

Present: Wes Boomgaarden, Tom Cetwinski, Tschera Connell, Nena Couch, Dan Noonan, Nancy O'Hanlon, Sally Rogers, Beth Whittaker

1. Agenda review.
2. Minutes (Nena)
3. Thanks to Tom for his many contributions to DISC and KB. Today is his last meeting.
4. Standards of practice in imaging: Moving image and sound (Dan) (postponed from 11/5 meeting)

Nothing has really changed in the last year. Recently Amy sent Dan a link to Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative Audio-Visual Working Group which we will want to follow: www.digitizationguidelines.gov/audio-visual/documents.html. It identifies other people working in the arena, but there are no standards produced yet. Two of the recurring resources are the Dance Heritage Coalition and Rutgers, both of which we have looked at before. Audio standards will be live on DISC website. Dan will draft a paragraph on the state of development of standards in the area of video.

Sally noted that the issue of avi files for Thompson screens has come up. The very large avi files are problem with our storage issues, so she is wondering if there is a possibility for compressed files since the displays for Thompson don't need to be preservation quality. The question is storage need for current use. Larry will test to see whether we can draw on material in KB. We also want to be careful about how much we put on streaming server, although they have not yet said anything about how much we are putting on it. Currently they are giving us three formats -- Flash (or QuickTime?), Microsoft, Real Player. Nena noted that the Dance Heritage Coalition and Bay Area Video Coalition will be looking at acceptable levels of compression for viewing moving images in their current project.

5. EDUCAUSE, Oct. 27-30 (Dan)

Dan felt that the point/counterpoint format was new this year and made sessions more interactive and useful, generating more potential collaboration; however, there was one session where it didn't exactly work because both were on the same side. See Dan's report submitted separately. Dan suggests that, in regards to the way we propose conference sessions, this might be a good format to use.

Two weeks ago several people from the Digital Union who had gone to EDUCAUSE got together to share what they had gotten from the conference. A report will be drafted.

There is discussion on how better to organize our attendees and utilize the EDUCAUSE experience.

6. Assessment Subcommittee: update of progress and design (Nancy and Nena)

Following the last DISC meeting where the subcommittee charge and charter were reviewed and suggestions made, Ruth, Nancy, Tschera, and Nena met to further review the documents. Following that meeting, external customer services operations were added. The documents distributed today include revisions from the DISC meeting, the follow-up meeting with Ruth, later work by Nancy and Nena, and a meeting last week of Sally, Wes, Nancy and Nena. The next steps for the subcommittee are: to get more feedback from DISC; to meet during the alternate DISC time (December) to gather information and to plan next steps; to talk with Tom.

Questions raised during the meeting included:

- the relationship of charge and charter. Even though they are very similar, we decided to keep both since the charter is for this particular project, and there may be additional assessment projects that would come under the charge.
- the KB as umbrella, KB as repository (point of confusion for subject specialists). The broader it is, the harder it is to get a handle on it. A lot of our digital projects that haven't been KB (DSpace) have come out of collections rather than coming to us from external users).

The suggestion was made to add "and the Assessment Committee" to bullet 4 of the charge.

Kathy Hall is the representative from Assessment Committee, and we are in process of recruiting another DISC member [Mary Scott has agreed to serve on the subcommittee].

Timetable activities for the near term are to learn Appreciative Inquiry (AI), to contact HR to see if someone there can give us instruction on AI, and to gather information.

7. DRMC update (Nena) (including outcome of discussion about provenance displaying in DRC and any info from the DSpace Users meeting)

The DRMC meeting ran very long due to extensive reporting by John Davison, and items including the provenance issue were not reached, nor did the subcommittees meet as had been expected. Nena was able to raise it as an issue, and it will be discussed at the December meeting.

8. Brief report of the outcome of the IMLS grant proposal with CMA (Nena)

The joint OSUL/CMA grant proposal to IMLS was not successful. We received the reviewers' comments, which were helpful in considering future applications. On the whole, the comments were favorable, although there were certain reviewers who had entirely opposite opinions of the same aspect of the project. The process is very competitive, and only a few projects were funded. We met with the CMA team to follow up, review the comments, and discuss whether to resubmit. The consensus of the group

was that if we resubmitted, it would be best to go for a planning grant this time. It was left that CMA would decide if they could go forward with a resubmission at this time; however, it is now really too late to do so since applications are due in February. The timing is bad for both organizations since we are both in the midst of major facilities projects. Nena would like to acknowledge Sarah's leadership in bringing together and keeping on task a very diverse group (from on campus and off), getting us to dream about possibilities, and then articulating a very complex project clearly in the proposal. Nena feels that it was a positive experience working with CMA, learning about each other's collections and operations, and that it will lead to future collaboration.

9. Storage update (Sally)

Beth and Sally met with OIT last Tuesday, hoping that OIT would be further along with getting the new storage set up, but it has taken longer than expected because it required many new IP addresses to be added and disc preparation. The expectation now is that the new storage will be online by late December. There is bad news from Michigan (Hathi Trust). It doesn't seem that we will be able to put the Lantern there anytime soon – they are not working on non-Google information with any speed. Although it supposedly has to happen within the next year, we shouldn't count on it. So we need to look at other options for the Lantern. We may have to use the new OIT space as a temporary solution. Sally had looked at OCLC's dark archive solution, but the pricing is not advantageous unless we put all 10 terabytes there at same time because they charge by in and out. Even if we wanted to use money that OCLC would cost to buy new storage through OIT, it took 18 months to get storage just now going up. The new storage space cost \$50,000 for 10.4 usable terabytes of space plus management plus floor space.

Beth and Amy asked – other options? Sally, possibly. Once we get storage up, see what we are going to have to have and how quickly. Doesn't think relying on Hathi Trust is solution at this point. Amy – should we compare rates at commercial providers? Sally – once storage gets up we have a little flexibility. Amy will send info on how much has been returned but speed has picked up so difficult to predict. Amy has on portable hard drives, but they aren't backed up. Sally will talk to Anita at OhioLINK, but they are having storage problems as well. They are trying to resolve stabilization problems with storage they have before ordering more. We don't really have money to do anything anywhere, so will have to look for economical options. Trying to figure out how we are going to sustain what we have with no budget.

10. Criteria for "what goes where" (i.e., KB vs. DRC vs. any other options such as CIC or other OhioLINK, such as EBC) (Tom, Tschera)

[DRC = OhioLINK's Digital Resource Commons; EBC = OhioLINK's E-book Center]

See document from KB Trio (sent to libdisc in advance) describing the different systems and what types of materials end up in each.

Tom noted that at first we wanted to create a critical mass in the KB, and that there are options available now that we didn't have in the beginning.

Tschera and Tom reviewed with DISC the documents that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Issues discussed were the goal of the hosting options document, the intended audience for the document, the level of detail of the document, suggestions to increase usability of the document, workflows such as brittle books, hosting options additions and changes, the role of the subject specialist in relation to the KB, ability to embargo, findability of content.

- Goal: to raise awareness.
- Intended audience: Staff and faculty of libraries. Document is intended to be used on web to explain where things go.
- Level of detail of the document: do collection managers care about this level of detail? Tom – yes because if they don't have it they are not comfortable talking about the repository with their constituents. Tschera – this is part of the information Jim wants collection managers to have. We must have the information in order to determine if we can meet community needs.
- Tschera noted that “What Goes Where” questions 1 and 2 have to be answered first because those answers determine whether content goes into the KB or not.
- Suggestions to increase usability of the document: Turn phrases into actual questions to make them more understandable. Expand acronyms. Make graphic to get attention. Put in language that is understandable to anyone, for instance: Rather than preservation – do you want to keep this forever? Relate to Google because people understand Google. Embargo: We have been pretty committed to open access – a community would have to come up with a very compelling argument for permanent no access; however, we can embargo for a period of time.
- Workflows such as brittle books: E-books at OhioLINK are not reflected in the document. Theses, dissertations, brittle books, e-books continue to go to OhioLINK, but have never fallen into decision tree because that decision pre-dates the KB. Most e-books go to OhioLINK, but some are delivered through the KB, and backup files are in the DSpace archive (dark archive). Books in the KB are part of a community collection (China Books, OSUP).
- Hosting options additions and changes: Include Electronic Book Center as one of hosting options. Remove CIC (Hathi Trust) as option.
- role of the subject specialist: Feedback from collection manager is that they don't know the options. They will go to faculty member to offer options and to say library will work with them. Many feel they are juggling a lot of jobs – may see themselves as making connections but may not see themselves as the ones who say we can do this for you or not, or do that with limited knowledge.
- Ability to embargo: we can embargo temporarily, but are committed to open access, so a community would have to have very convincing reasons for embargo to be permanent.
- issue of findability: not addressed in document.

Other: Tamar has expressed interest in 44 of 70+ collections as possible Archives-linked collections.

Let Tschera know if questions or comments.

Next steps: revise for web.

11. DISC web site deferred to Jan. 14 (meeting moratorium week is first full week of quarter)

12. Other:

Tom will make a list of significant additions to the KB for addition to the website.

January 14, 2009 (minutes: Amy)

- DISC web site topic
- Update on PDF-A online training progress (Beth, Amy, Dan)
- Addition to DISC web site - something on "what goes where"
- DISC annual report to the Faculty (scheduled for Feb. Fac.meeting)
- Dare first available in DRC 9/29/08 - looked good at the 11/5 DISC meeting - Beth B. investigating the URL issue
- setting the DISC 2009 agendas
- begin year by evaluating work of previous year as we did last year