

DRAFT

ISRAC Minutes: Friday January 27, 2006 Telephone Conference Call

Present: Maryly Snow, Emily Lin, Margaret Hogarth, Greg Careaga, Brian Warling, Vickie O'Riordan, Maureen Burns

1. Linking to the Databases

Discussion: Links to specific Insight Databases from Library web pages can go directly to the Web browser version (there's a PID for each) or to the top of the UC Image Service page. This can be confusing since a user may have to scroll down to locate the database he or she had just tried to access. It would be good to modify that page so that we could link directly to the entry for a specific database on that page, not just to the top.

ACTION: Ask CDL to put internal anchors in that page to allow for this kind of linking.

2. HOPS update:

Discussion: Catherine Friedman (HOPS UCSD member) had drafted a response to the list ISRAC report. It will be on the agenda of the next HOPS conference call (early February). The outcome will be communicated to ISRAC sometime after that.

ACTION: None

3: Listing of UC Image Service (as opposed to individual collections) in Campus Libraries' Databases lists

Discussion: Currently listed at UCM and UCD. It will be added shortly to UCR, UCSD, and UCSF. Some of the other campus libraries have been asked to list it, but haven't yet done so. The listing of individual collections was also discussed. Should every individual collection in UCIS be listed separately? Recommended that this be decided campus-by-campus.

ACTION: Members from those campuses that haven't yet added UCIS to database lists will continue to try to get it included.

4. Collection Development

Discussion: Lengthy discussion on how to evaluate Insight-ready collections for inclusion in UCIS and what path to follow to get them included. Main points included:

- a. As there is no systemwide group currently reporting to the JSC that focuses on still images, Sliders might consider requesting formal recognition by CDC so that they could evaluate, prioritize and recommend collections for inclusion in UCIS. This idea has already been raised to Lorelei Tanji (UCI) who will bring it up for further discussion at JSC.

- b. What criteria should be used to evaluate the collections: content?, size?, technical specifications?. While quality and relevance are clearly essential, too long an evaluation checklist would be unnecessarily cumbersome. Since all collections being evaluated in this context are Insight ready and free, an abbreviated evaluation should be sufficient.

There should also be a more extensive checklist of criteria to be used in evaluating non-Insight ready collections.

The disadvantage of simply including every available Insight-ready collection is that there is no way to order them or group them in the Client, so that patrons would be faced with a too-long list of options to choose among.

c. It would be useful to have shorter descriptions of collections appear in the client than are currently used. These would be more readily scanned by patrons for relevance. Could links be included that would direct patrons to more detailed information.

ACTION: Maryly will draft shorter descriptions with a more information link.

5. Copyright

Discussion: What are the copyright issues associated with providing access to locally produced image collections. Options to permit compliance with copyright law may include making sites password-protected or otherwise limiting access; showing only thumbnail images, not large size images. Members talked about different sources of legal advice/expertise on this topic.

ACTION: Emily will send out a copyright presentation that she has created.