Digital Repositories\* Governance Structure

*Proposal Draft, June 25, 2019*

# \*Denotes a longer-term vision for the development of CSU Digital Repositories, beyond ScholarWorks implementation. It affirms COLD commitment to development and implementation of a digital archives/collections repository solution, after successful ScholarWorks implementation.

# Purpose of Digital Repositories Steering Committee:

* *The Digital Repositories steering committee’s main goal is to establish necessary guidelines and priorities for creating a sustainable repository system (ScholarWorks) and suite of services; implement these services, and then manage and enhance them.*

*Creating a sustainable repository system requires:*

1. *Identifying and establishing ongoing funding/revenue sources and models*
2. *Adherence to international standards and best practices*
3. *Development and management of user-needed platforms*
4. *Development and management of user-needed services*
5. *Development of policies to mitigate risk (structural, physical, legal, information, etc.)*
6. *Support of open access initiatives, via technology integration and OA policy implementation*

* *The steering committee will focus on both developing and implementing platforms and services for institutional repositories and digital collections, with immediate focus on ScholarWorks and later focus on digital collections and archives;*
* *The steering committee will report to COLD Executive Committee, while including representatives from across the CSU, and members of the Community of Practice. Overall size and composition TBD; but no more than 10-12 members, with variable terms;*
* *The Scholarly Communications and STIM committees will serve in an advisory capacity, providing expertise when needed;*
* *The steering committee will suggest developing technologies to help implement open access policies (local, national, or international)*

# Digital Repositories Steering Committee Governance Structure

1. **Three-tiered Structure**
   1. COLD Executive Committee
   2. Digital Repositories Steering Committee; *STIM & ScholCom (advisory roles)*
   3. Digital Repositories Working Groups
2. **Membership (10-12 committee members + 2 ex-officio)** 
   1. Digital Repositories Steering Committee members
      1. 1 Chair (COLD member; appointed by COLD EC);
      2. 5-6 Chairs of SW Working Groups (communities of practice and interest groups);
      3. 1 ScholCom and 1 STIM representative;
      4. 2 at-large members from CSU libraries (all campuses);
      5. 1 Director, Systemwide Digital Library Services (CO) – ex-officio;
      6. 1 Project manager (CO) – ex-officio
   2. Digital repository working groups (drawn from existing communities of practice and interest groups)
      1. Publishing
      2. Metadata
      3. Faculty profiles
      4. Digital archives
      5. Best practices/Trusted repository
      6. [possible] Open Access policy & technology facilitation
3. **Scheduling and basic logistics**
   1. Monthly meetings and reports to COLD (or COLD EC)
   2. Advisory groups: (STIM / ScholCom) will provide input at the request of the DR Steering Committee – especially related to CSU policy and specific expertise (i.e. copyright; handles; OA policy making; etc.);
   3. Interest groups will provide specific findings and investigate goals specified by steering committee; work in coordination with task forces; longer-term and ongoing issues
   4. Task forces will work to meet specific short-term goals: i.e. via code sprints; drafting a repository mission statement, etc.;
4. **Unresolved Issues:**
   1. Overall size and makeup of the group, including
      1. Number of interest and working group reps
      2. Membership rotation schedules and member terms (possible mix of one-year and two-year terms to allow for staggered appointments)
   2. Funding
      1. Appropriateness / feasibility of a member-payment model
      2. Funds beyond the current 1-year (2019-2020) commitment
      3. Grant writing goals
   3. Short-, mid-, and long-term group goals and future directions
   4. Nature and role of Open Access advocacy

# Appendix I. membership models consulted:

For more information about the models consulted in the development of this proposal, refer to the SWAT Team Report here: <https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/SCHOL/pages/12877843/Reports>

* Mountain Scholar: Pay two-state membership model controlled by libraries
* Texas Digital Library (TDL): tiered pay-in membership model controlled centrally with 7 person governing board and 22-person member board;
* California Digital Library (CDL): free membership model to UC campuses; central funding independent of library budgets; grant funded;
* Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC): non-profit organization; equal-partners membership model;

## Model analysis:

The various models need not be taken “as-is”. Each model can be adjusted or even mixed together to meet the CSU system’s current needs.

Mountain Scholar has a single instance of DSpace used for 9 institutions, with one university taking the lead and securing grant funding. Their pay-in membership model could be emulated by the CSU system if the CO takes on that central role instead of a campus. Each member campus would pay in with an equal but reasonable amount.

The TDL model has a slightly different approach that may provide a clearer reality for the CSU. Since every campus in the system is of different size, budget and orientation, a pricing model based on FTE might be a more realistic way to have campuses directly support the repository and its services.

CDL’s approach would require a much larger governing body, including not only librarians and library administrators but also educators, statewide faculty senate members, publishers and press. This may be more difficult or less desirable to emulate, despite the clear success the model provides.

Finally, the WRLC model, which we have mostly copied here and aligned with the old ULMS governance model, allows the CSU campuses to keep participating as equal members but does not require membership buy-in. It may be the most feasible to implement in the short-to-medium-term, but does not solve the main intertwined issues of funding and staffing.