

ISRAC Conference Call

11/18/2005

Present: Maureen Burns (UCI), Greg Careaga (UCSC), Dan Goldstein (UCD), Margaret Hogarth (UCR), Emily Lin (UCM), Susan Moon (UCSB), Vickie O'Riordan (UCSD), Maryly Snow (UCB), Brian Warling (UCSF), Lena Zentall (CDL).

Not Present: Stephen Davison (UCLA), Rosalie Lack (CDL)

MINUTES

HOPS RESPONSE. There has been no response yet from HOPS about the 2nd quarterly report. Emily provided an informal update from her conversations with Donald. There's a HOPS conference call on December 8th in which they will be discussing ISRAC issues and the 2nd report. It seems that there are various interpretations of charge and what exactly ISRAC is supposed to accomplish. HOPS feels that we've done our part and SOPAG thinks we need to do the rollout. It is hoped this will be clarified and conveyed soon thereafter. Meanwhile, we will keep moving forward.

INGEST UPDATE

Lena reported on where CDL is at in terms of the ingest of images into the UC Image Service. On November 15th they started a draft of ingest options, but a finalized version won't be available until mid-January. They are running the draft by the Digital Library Services Group and are discussing it with UCM (Emily Lin and Lisa Mix) and UCSF (Kathleen Cameron) to try to understand some of the complex needs and specific use cases. They will be connecting with others including ISRAC for input. However, the draft is not mature enough for ISRAC to review yet. Maryly wanted to know more about when SPIRO would be added as well as other new images, but it appears it will need to wait until the basic requirements for ingest have been worked out. This is going to probably take a few months for the various committees to review, for staff resources to be considered, and a variety of associated issues to be resolved since CDL is ingesting in many areas. In addition, a new version of Insight will be released in January with advanced features that may assist with ingest and it may take some time to get it up and running. CDL has identified a few things that need to be developed, for example transforming metadata to METS and back again. Meanwhile, ISRAC should work on collection development recommendations. CDL needs us to let them know locally about what's going on with systems and who wants to share. A survey is being developed to get a better sense of the VR/librarian/special collections landscape and to obtain a better understanding of local systems.

[CDL's Image Service Team consists of the following: Laine Farley, Lena Zentall, Rosalie Lack, Brian Tingle, and Lynn Cameron and the Ingest Team all of the above with Robin Chandler, Adrian Turner, and Bill Landis]

PC TESTING

Maureen is gathering information and will be sending an updated document to CDL and ISRAC early next week detailing the reasons for testing, who will be involved, and what the assessment might look like.

Who wants to participate in testing Insight's personal collections feature was discussed. Three ISRAC members are interested: Brian, Emily, and Maureen. Brian will send more information about UCSF's interest. Several visual resources curators want to test it too.

Laine and Lena met to scope out what is involved in the testing. CDL will tell us more about testing limitations as some of the technical issues are worked out, but they probably can't make a commitment to supporting the personal collections that will be added during the testing. All testers will need to be made aware of this in advance and that they will need to be available to help with assessment too. Export should be a part of the testing to determine how easy it is to get the images and descriptive data back out. The question was raised about how much training or technical support might be necessary for staff to support the testing. Maureen mentioned that the online help looks extensive and Lena will try to find out more. There are a few template choices for metadata and it was suggested that staff test this first, although anyone can create a new template and UCSF will probably have to. It was suggested that the ISRAC person on each of the test campuses get involved to help with feedback. Are ISRACers willing and able to do this? Technical requirements will be sent to the group. It looks like a new tech person at CDL, Eric, will be involved and this additional staff resource should help enormously.

In terms of timing, it appears that January may work, but CDL will try to figure out constraints and guidelines sooner. What the duration of the testing should be was also considered. Most thought that testing should last at least a month, but probably most of a quarter/semester.

The question was asked as to whether ISRAC was supposed to come up with a minimum metadata standard? Emily thought that was part of our charge and will check. Should we require a minimum amount of information for the testing? Maureen mentioned that the user of PC is only required to fill in a minimum of one field. Could be interesting to make this part of the testing to get a better idea about how much a user might be willing to do to better understand user requirements. Perhaps a minimum standard could be suggested, but most thought it would be hard to require this. It does seem that testers may want some direction in terms of the data, but they may also want to do their own thing. Keywords may not happen, but could be suggested as well. Brian thought it is highly likely that the staff facilitators may have to assist or do the data entry. It would be interesting to record what it takes and who ends up

doing it. Emily thought we should try to obtain some information about the source of the images, i.e., where they are coming from. UCSF's material will be born digital. Since there may be copyright issues, some data should be gathered about this in the assessment. It was suggested that it might be interesting to see if the metadata changes over the testing time. Local facilitators could probably report on this. A question was raised about whether entry date is a required field or whether it would be automatically generated.

Maureen mentioned that she and Rosalie roughed out an assessment plan and added it to the existing testing document. Several suggestions were discussed. The large open question of what is the point of adding materials to PC should be addressed. How will the testers end up using the UC IS once their PC is in there? Is it easiest enough to use and acceptable? We should try to get a better sense of how this might help people in their teaching and research? Any other questions should be shared in order to insure we get answers to all our concerns. In terms of usability, we can eventually let Luna know what we felt worked well and didn't work well.

The question was raised about who gets to see a given PC in the UC IS and how widely can a PC be shared? Lena thinks it depends on the user group and account. For the testing, there may only be one user group and account so we will probably all be able to see the collections tested, but not be able to edit. This could be interesting, if testers see each others' collections it may inspire them to do more. It was asked whether the PCs would turn up as a list to choose from similar to the existing collections, but it is uncertain. Many of the questions will be answered as we move towards the testing and when the testing occurs.

Lena mentioned that Adam Hochman, who works with Mara Hancock in UCB's Educational Technology, is creating image tools and a personal collections feature for faculty to use that works with Sakai and B-Space. So, there might be other things that are simpler to use than Insight. The question was asked if experience with ARTstor might help with this test too? Vickie mentioned that ARTstor's personal collections feature works well, but you can only add 5 images at a time. The PC then looks like any other collection in ARTstor. Students can log in and see the PCs. You can see it or you can show it to everyone in the institution or class. Maureen mentioned that the UCB and UCSC VR testers are interested in comparing Insight's PC with their experiences with ARTstor. It would be really interesting to get all the users together to talk about what works well and doesn't work well, whether Almagest, ARTstor, Insight, or UCB's new tools.

The question was asked whether all the UC campuses have VPN without which the UC IS can't be accessed from home. It appears that everyone has it except, Davis and Santa Barbara (campus reps, please verify)?

FOLDER MANGEMENT

CDL is looking into the various options for folder management. They need to do more of an assessment about what it would take and what the options are, but Emily and Dan's recommendations are helpful. Development at CDL or Luna may be necessary. This was moved down on the priorities list so that testing PC can go first. ISRAC has done their job in terms of the initial scoping needed at this point and technical evaluation will follow. ISRAC may want to make some recommendations on cleaning-up data, time cycles, and other things. CDL needs to determine how much development makes sense and will get back to ISRAC on all of this.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Guidelines need to be developed for evaluating different kinds of collections for Insight. How might this differ from the existing process with JSCSC recommendations to CDL? A pathway should be recommended to deal with both tier 1 and tier 2 materials. The question was raised about how to deal with collections we don't need to purchase, such as those in Rumsey? How should this work. ISRAC needs to discuss this and make recommendations for the various scenarios. Other questions were raised. How do you prioritize and assess faculty needs? Who needs to be involved? Dan will work with Maryly on this, but they also welcome other volunteers (3-4 total). It was suggested that they check OAC and see what their existing documents outline in terms of process. It is hoped they can get going on this rather than wait until the next conference call.

MB/ISRAC_minutes_11_18_2005