Testing Insight’s Personal Collections

Why Do UC Campuses Want To Use Insight’s Personal Collection (PC) Tools?

- With the ease of acquiring digital images from a variety of sources—World Wide Web, campus licensed resources (AP Photo Archive, RLG’s Cultural Materials, etc.), local scanning, UC Image Service, Rumsey Visual Collections, etc.—UC faculty and students are rapidly building personal image collections that they want to use for research, teaching, and study. Many are requesting guidance and assistance from staff for managing their existing analog and growing digital image collections.

- Early assessment of the UC Imager Service demonstrator project and the subsequent outreach report indicated that potential adopters want to be able to use both personal and institutional image collections with the centralized image service and evaluations at other institutions resulted in similar findings. (See reports at http://www.libraries.psu.edu/vius/index.html & http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/image/#project_report).

- A system’s ability to spontaneously add local image content to presentations is crucial for instruction and could be a ‘make or break’ situation for interesting faculty and students in adopting digital image technology. The Image Service Rollout and Advisory Committee (ISRAC) believes the use of Insight’s PC tools will be a major inducement for faculty and student adoption of the UC Image Service.

- Since several UC campuses now have access to both the UC Image Service and ARTstor, it will not be an equal test of the two image services functionality and adopters’ preferences, if the more advanced features of Insight are not made available, especially PC. ARTstor’s personal collection feature and offline image viewer are powerful inducements: they allow spontaneous additions and help manage local image collections with the central ones.

Who Wants To Test Insight’s Personal Collections and When?

UC’s Visual Resources Group (Sliders) has been eager to access PC since it was announced by Luna as a new development for the reasons stated above. UCI had a faculty member alpha test PC with positive results (see report under assessment at http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/image/#project_report). Several ISRAC members have also volunteered to work with campus faculty on testing PC—Irvine, Merced, and San Francisco. Six potential testers have expressed an interest (summarized below). In some cases, the staff would like to test the software first before involving faculty, in others both faculty and staff will need to be involved in the testing for the best results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC CAMPUS</th>
<th>CONTACT/ TESTERS</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>INTERESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley-Art History</td>
<td>Jan Eklund &amp; VRC Staff</td>
<td>Now or anytime in 2006</td>
<td>Wants to Compare Usability of Insight’s PC to ARTstor’s PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Maureen Burns &amp; 1 East Asian Languages and Literatures Faculty</td>
<td>Now until Dec. 16th or anytime in 2006</td>
<td>Add 1,000 Images of Japanese Theater (or a subset) &amp; Share with all UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>Emily Lin &amp; Library Staff with Possibility of Faculty Usage</td>
<td>January for Staff February-May for Faculty</td>
<td>Need System to Manage Digital Images &amp; Want to Test Interoperability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Brian Warling &amp; Faculty</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Want to Add Medical/Science Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Jackie Spafford &amp; 1-2 Art History Faculty</td>
<td>Winter Quarter 2006</td>
<td>Want to Add Personal Collections for Visual Culture and Chinese Art Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Kathleen Hardin (staff want to test it first, but can involve faculty)</td>
<td>Anytime, sooner preferred</td>
<td>Test PC to see if it will work well for spontaneous addition of campus holdings, has faculty using ARTstor PC and OIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See expanded interests of the various campuses below.)

At present, it seems that more testers and time will be available after the holidays and so starting testing in January 2006 (after the commencement of a new quarter has slowed) and continuing for a month or more might be the most feasible option. A longer testing period into May has also been suggested.

**Why Test Insight’s Personal Collections Now?**

The 2005-2006 academic year is seeing a remarkable shift in UC faculty’s interest in teaching with digital images, probably related to the following: Kodak’s ending slide projector production, closure or transition of photographic service bureaus from film to digital, difficulty of readily finding 35mm slide film, removal of slide projectors from UC classrooms, and peer pressure. UC Visual Resources curators are moving to digital copystands to more efficiently meet local demand for digital images as well as scanning portions of their large analog collections (totaling over 3 million images) and are being challenged to find ways to make these digital images readily accessible on the Web.
Not only do faculty want to use their personal collections, but they also want to use their campus Visual Resources Collections since these image collections are customized to their teaching needs and are primarily used for teaching. Testing PC is the first step in determining whether the spontaneous addition of local images will induce faculty to use the UC Image Service in the classroom and determine to what extent PC is adequate to meet the needs of institutional slide collections. UC campus database and Web server research and development is underway to support this recent demand for digital images from UC collections (both in the Libraries and VRCs). To avoid large scale redundancy and the building of silos of images accessible only to a limited number of UC campus users, PC should be tested. It would also be desirable to test Insight’s Studio tools for institutional collections for similar reasons.

Campus staff working with faculty on testing PC will be able to evaluate the image quality, software tools, user experiences, support issues, etc. In addition, the strength and uniqueness of individual faculty collections might be better understood, some of which might be suitable candidates for institutionally-hosted collections. This might assist with determining when image collections should stay local and when they should graduate to institutional collections.

The different levels of sharing personal collections allowed by the Insight software should be explored, for example, if a personal collection at UCB could be shared with a colleague at UCSB, since a number of interesting developments are occurring with file-sharing in peer-to-peer networks, such as Penn State’s LionShare (see http://lionshare.its.psu.edu/main/). In addition to usability testing and local campus image management issues, the technological administrator’s role in supporting such PC usage should be assessed to determine the viability of supporting the PC functionality for all UC campuses.

Assessment (first draft based on phone conversation with Rosalie Lack on 11-16-2005)
The potential testers consist of two different types of users—staff and faculty—who may work alone, but more likely in partnership on the testing. Therefore, these two perspectives should be sought and recorded in the assessment. The following are the questions to be studied with associated issues and who might gather the data through observation and written reports (CDL staff, VRC/Library campus staff, campus faculty).

1) What is the work process necessary to provide UC users with access to the personal collections feature? (CDL and VRC/Library staff)
   a. What does the CDL technical administrator have to do to set PC up?
   b. Are passwords necessary and who manages such accounts?
   c. Is the help on the Insight Web site adequate training for staff experimentation and facilitation?
   d. Do we need a CDL contact for help or a Luna contact for help, or both, and can they be notified in advance and be available for troubleshooting when faculty schedule testing?
   e. Who needs to do what to make experiment work?
   f. Other issues as they arise.
2) What are the users’ experiences with personal collections testing? (VRC/Library staff and campus faculty)
   a. Compare image quality differences between images in PC and images in the central service.
   b. How is descriptive data added and who adds it?
   c. How much descriptive data does the user require is a minimal standard necessary?
   d. Usability of available software tools.
   e. Interoperability and exportability of images and data.
   f. Who needs to do what to make the experiment work?
   g. Other issues as they arise.

3) How do we judge if the test of PC is successful? (CDL & VRC/Library staff)
   a. Are the support issues for expanded UC use of PC manageable?
   b. Were the testers’ experiences mostly positive or negative?
   c. Do testers care more about adding personal collections or institutional collections to the centralized system?
   d. Were testers interested in sharing personal collections and if so at what levels (personal only, departmental, campus only, UC system)?
   e. Are testers more interested in using UC Image Service for research, teaching, and study?
   f. How did it help them and what do think about its educational usefulness in the future?
   g. Open-ended feedback.

Methods for gathering data will include primarily recording experiences (CDL and VRC/Library staff) and observations of faculty usage (VRC/Library staff). An early and important goal is to better understand the necessary people and processes involved in making PC available to UC. Perhaps, short guided interviews or questionnaires will be in order, but it has yet to be determined. VRC/Library participants will need to be involved in the assessment process as experimenters, observers, and recorders. CDL should record technological administration issues. ISRAC should guide the process and assessment synthesizing findings in a summary report.

**Campus Interest in Testing Personal Collections**
(from e-mail and phone exchanges)

**UCB-AH** (Jan Eklund, VRC)
I would love to test PC and put some of the Neuerburg material up. The ancient specialist in Art History is busy, but I have been showing him this stuff all along and he is genuinely enthusiastic. He really is planning to use it next year so presumably at some point he’ll have to get his feet wet. I loaded a small group (only 13) of images into an ARTstor Personal Collection Folder and I would like to compare the two processes. So far, I can relate the following about the ARTstor process.

**Pros:**
1. Relatively easy to do. Interface was reasonably intuitive.
2. Easy to set access permissions. You can keep the folder totally private (user only read/write), make it available and editable to one or more GSIs or RAs with a separate
password (group read/write), make it available to individual students in a class via another password (read only), or make it available institution-wide (available to anyone coming from your institutional domain.)
3. If you make your images available institution-wide, they show up in a search along with all the rest of the ARTstor images.
4. Zoomable images! The jpegs I uploaded were all about 500K (1812x1215 pixels) and they look good and zoom well.

Cons:
1. You can only upload 5 images at a time. No way to bulk upload at the present time.
2. No way to upload metadata with the images. It all has to be typed in on the web. No way to copy the metadata from one record into another, not even by cutting & pasting because you can only have one editable record open at a time.
3. The upload process automatically puts the image filename in the Title field, which is a drag for those of us who name our image files by accession number. This means EVERY title has to be edited and the accession number manually cut and pasted into the Accession number field.
4. I uncovered a couple of bugs. If you upload a replacement image the thumbnail image disappears, even though the new replacement image appears if you double click in the blank box... Also, if you paste a lot of information into a field like description, it turns into a scrolling field which cannot be edited again. This means if you made a typo, or want to eliminate it and start over, you can't. These are both bugs that ARTstor is aware of.

Bottom line is I think the Personal Collection feature of ARTstor might be good for faculty who just want to add a few of their own images with tombstone info only. I understand they are piloting the hosting of institutional collections at a few places. Presumably this involves bulk uploading of images and metadata in some form. The last time I spoke with a techie from ARTstor he said they were accepting data in lots of different formats so maybe there's hope for something like a Core 4.0 XML ingest.

UCI (Maureen Burns, ISRAC & VRC)
Susan Klein, faculty in East Asian Languages and Literatures, is interested in adding 1,000 images (or a subset thereof) of Japanese theater from the 1940s-1960s to the UC Image Service using the personal collections feature. The images can be added immediately, but the descriptive data is not yet researched and will take more time to add (it will probably be minimal as well). Fall, Winter, or Spring quarters work for testing and she is willing to assist with assessment. In addition, she would like to see this personal collection shared with other users of the UC Image Service.

UCM (Emily Lin, ISRAC)
Merced is interested in PC testing, library staff for the time being, with the possibility of adding faculty later. For library staff, testing could begin mid January. Any faculty participation would probably be later, perhaps mid February, and I'd suggest through the end of the semester (mid-May) rather than making it a short testing period. The why: Merced is using Sakai for management of course resources, but there is no system in place for the managing of image collections used in teaching. The library has been supporting digitization of course materials. We would like to participate in PC testing to
have a better understanding of the tool and how it might integrate with other online resources and content management tools. Also, if we are able to introduce Insight as a PC tool, we can also encourage instructors to look (first) at the collections available in Insight.

**UCR** (Madelyn Millen, VRC, and faculty decided they could not participate at this time)  
*Add me to the list of those interested in testing the PC. I would like to give it a go & am sure that the chair of the AH department (she is currently doing some testing with the Insight collections) will be very interested as well. She has a substantial personal collection.*

My Chair, Pat Morton, is very interested but the timing is just not good for her right now. She/we are working on her first digital class in Winter Qtr, so to add anything to her plate is not advisable. She did express interest in participating in tests and or discussions with faculty that may take place in the future. I wish we could help out.

**UCSF** (Brian Warling, ISRAC)  
*Here at UCSF, we would plan to ask 2-3 faculty members to participate in a test of Insight’s personal collections feature. They plan on adding born digital medical and science content.*

**UCSB** (Jackie Spafford, VRC)  
*I have 1 to 2 people ready to go, one teaching Visual Culture and the other the Chinese specialist. Both have large personal collections and little metadata and have expressed an interest in finding solutions for managing their personal collections. Jackie Spafford will provide the staff support.*

**UCSC** (Kathleen Hardin, VRC)  
*Yes, I am interested still interested. I am willing to work within CDL's time frame, "Nov, Dec, Winter Quarter, whatever ...." My preference is sooner rather than later. It would involve Belinda and me if we are testing it as a potential way to incorporate local campus holdings for faculty to have digital access to. If you are more interested in adding faculty collections, I have a couple we could approach. I have backed off from mentioning this as a possibility since it has seemed stalled for so long. We have two HAVC faculty who are adding scanned slides into personal collections in ARTstor and one temporary HAVC lecturer (seemingly technologically challenged) who has been just adding scans to his lectures using ARTstor OIV and bending everyone's ear with his frustrations.*

Having tested Inscribe, I am interested in seeing first hand if the personal collection is too onerous and clunky for ready adoption by faculty. As always, we can modify our project to match CDL’s goals. We have unlimited projects to work with it seems.
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