ISRAC Minutes for October 7, 2005

Conference Call, 10:00 am – 11: 00 am

Present: Vicki, O'Riordan (UCSD), Dan Goldstein (UCD), Greg Careaga (UCSC), Rosalie Lack (CDL), Susan Moon (UCSB), Maryly Snow (UCB, co-chair)

Absent: Stephen Davison (UCLA), Margaret Hogarth (UCR), Maureen Burns (UCI), Brian Warling (UCSF), Emily Lin (UCM, co-chair)

Recorder: Maryly Snow

1. **Second Quarterly Report to HOPS**. Maryly reported that she and Emily have not begun working on the second quarterly report to HOPS, nor completed their revised first quarterly report to HOPS, the one that HOPS suggested use more persuasive, less mandatory tone. That revised first quarterly report will be rolled into the second quarterly report. We all admitted to feeling thrown off track by HOPS' insistence that individual campuses are free to follow or ignore our recommendations, and that our role is merely to make recommendations, not to take action. We agreed that in quarterly report should begin with a broad explanatory background description of the issues, and that can lead up to the detailed proposed work plan. We also acknowledged among ourselves that we really don't know how to proceed. Who will follow up and coordinate among all the issues, action items, and recommendations to HOPS items that we have determined are necessary for a successful rollout of UC Image Service?

The broad background will focus on, among other issues:
    the hybrid nature of the tool, which is both a library and instructional resource, reminding them that slide projectors and carousels are no longer being manufactured;
    that UC Image Service is a centralized CDL image service independent of, but currently using, and Insight, is in the process of becoming the UC repository of digital images, that everyone thinks it's not their "job" or "responsibility" to teach/host/deliver UC Image Service,
    that nothing comparable in newness, complexity, format, and hybrid nature and on this scale has been "rolled out" before: there are no precedents
    basically reasserting the full role of ISRAC as a joint committee –otherwise, each campus ISRAC member and each campus HOPS member could roll out UCIS on their own
    (from a previous meeting -that ARTstor and Insight are complementary, not competing)
    (Maryly couldn't resist adding these two thoughts - that because there are no precedents, we request that HOPS seriously consider acting in concert; that the charge to ISRAC is complex and demands action, not merely recommendations. Rolling out complex library-instructional software is NOT like setting policy that another committee implements)

2. Roll-out Work Plan. Rosalie and Maureen. We briefly discussed the revised work plan. This document summarizes, in brief form, the various aspects of roll-out that we have discussed to date and that are specified in the ISRAC charge. **Everyone agreed to review the work plan and to send comments to Susan Moon by Tuesday Oct. 11. Susan agreed to make changes and to review it for consistency, clarity, and punctuation, and to send it to Maryly and Emily late this week (by Oct. 14 at the latest)**

3. Permissions/Folders and Groups. Dan summarized the issues that the permissions subgroup (Brian, Dan, Rosalie, and Lena) have delineated to date. Essentially, they have been trying to clarify what they'd like to do for folder management and the saving of groups and presentations versus what the software is reasonably able to do at this time. Dan reported that there are basically 3 issues:

1. What is reasonable and technologically feasible: Clean up the existing folders and groups system. Move existing groups into a catch-all folder. Create a new line of folders, one for each campus. There will be no restrictions on access. Thus, we must rely on a voluntary set of best practices.
2. Develop a set of best practices. Advise users on logical saving and naming conventions. Advise users to keep their groups and presentations saved on their own computers, especially those that require security. This system relies on personal virtue, at least until Luna Insight might develop a different security system. Workload would be staggering if we assigned individual passwords and permission levels to all users. The campus level folder and best practices is a work-around. Naming recommendation could be: departmental subfolders (Art History AH), then course folders (AH102a), then faculty folders (ts1), then lecture folders. Or: departmental (Art History AH), then faculty (TS), then course (AH102a), then lecture (lec1-2005, lec 2-2005). Question of how to disseminate best practices was raised but not explored.
3. On going maintenance. We hope that CDL will assume responsibility for on-going maintenance of folders. Rosalie suggests that ISRAC could recommend an annual clean-up. For instance, at the end of each academic year, sweep groups into prior year folder. Rosalie suggested that at the time of the year-end clean-up, if group had not been worked on/updated within the past three months, it would be swept into a prior year folder. Maryly suggested a test/practice/train folder for each campus that is separate from the permanent folder for each campus. Rosalie responded that each campus could probably set up a permanent and a test folder within its own campus folder.

This system would work if permissions could be modified for users to create their own subfolders, and folders within subfolders? Rosalie will double check. The folders/permissions/security subgroup will ask our Luna contact Michelle to meet with them once they have some more of these matters hammered out.

4. Self-training comments. Margaret compiled Maureen's and her summary comments into a structured document suitable for sharing with Luna. Maureen suggested that the

document be shared first with the CDL Image Service team and let them what is appropriate to forward to Luna, as some of the items might reflect our inexperience more than Luna's complexity. **Rosalie will share the training comments document with CDL Image Service team. The team can annotate items that are not a problem for the Image Service team, and send the document back to Maryly for review before deciding the next step.**

5. Brief discussion of other complicated issues, one of which was collection development, especially how to think about the Insight-ready free collections. How to recommend? Do they need to be cataloged? Can they just be accessible? If ISRAC recommends that any Insight-ready free collection be included (CDL does not have to ingest – merely has to request and receive the "key", the collection might still have to be cataloged. Numerous small collections, without a "search all" button, could also be onerous. In addition, Personal collections feature needs to be tested, but we can't proceed on that until we hear from HOPS.