

5/16/2011 LTAG Meeting Notes

Library Technology Advisory Group (LTAG)

Monday, May 16, 2011

Meeting – 10:00 AM - 3:30 PM

Attending: Adrian Petrisor (UCI, Chair), Ann Dobson (UCSF), Dan Suchy (LAUC), Dale Snapp (UCD), Declan Fleming (UCSD), Eric Mitchell (UCSC), John Ajao (UCSB), John Ober (CDL), Terry Toy (UCR), Tom Bustos (UCM), Lynne Grigsby (UCB)

Absent: Donald Barclay (SOPAG), Todd Grappone (UCLA)

Note taker: Dan Suchy, Adrian Petrisor

1. Review of action items from 4/18/10

- Adrian will continue the communication with RSC's Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group in order to get support for shibbolization of MyILL

2. Future of LTAG: possible options provided by SOPAG

Option A: LTAG continues to exist as a separate ACG

- Advantages:
 - LTAG brings together a wide variety of technology expertise and approaches to a breadth of technologies and applications in the same group
 - LTAG is poised to provide collective wisdom and technology perspective to NGTS project teams
 - it is best positioned to assist with digital library projects implementation
 - the individual members have many opportunities to enhance their knowledge from the other members of the group
 - this group has the optimal structure for making system-wide technical decisions, and to provide advice for system-wide projects
 - has ability to quickly adapt to changes in the technology world
 - technology becomes an increasingly important component of any system-wide project, and the breadth of expertise of the members of this group is conducive to a better decision-making process
- Disadvantages:
 - historically, the group hasn't been well connected with the other ACGs, although the recent initiative to invite the chairs of ACGs as guests to some of LTAG meetings is improving the communication
 - due to less than optimal communication, LTAG could be perceived as isolated, and vulnerable to groupthink

Option B: The technology advisory function of LTAG is integrated into the other ACGs, and LTAG no longer exists as a separate ACG

- Advantages:

- this option will ensure a continuous presence of a member with appropriate technical expertise to the discussions in the ACGs
- Disadvantages:
 - the individuals selected to be members of the ACGs will not have the wide variety of technology expertise and approaches
 - due to less than optimal communication, LTAG could be perceived as isolated, and vulnerable to groupthink

Upon weighing on the two above-mentioned options, LTAG members identified a third option, which, in our view, would provide the most value to the UC Libraries in general, and to the other ACG's. Therefore, **LTAG recommends** a combination of options A and B, where **LTAG will continue to exist, with increased asynchronous communication (e.g., through email) and fewer conference calls, and some of its members will be appointed to the other ACG's to provide technical advice. This option acknowledges the importance of deep technical expertise and collaboration given:**

- a) **the role of technology in nearly all strategic and operational UC-library initiatives**
- b) **the need for more, not less, cross-functional coordination under the strengthened systemwide collective aspirations as represented, e.g. by NGTS.**

- Advantages:
 - this option would combine all the benefits of the two above-mentioned options
 - LTAG members would represent technology issues on appropriate ACGs. Full benefits will be achieved if the individual is an active member of the ACG, and not just an advisor.
 - the technical representatives will report back progress and updates from their ACGs to the regular LTAG meeting
- Disadvantages:
 - there will be an higher time commitment for the LTAG members that are part of ACGs, but this could be somehow offset through less frequent LTAG meetings and/or better email communication.

3. **Gap analysis:** identify areas in UC Libraries operations where use of technology can create cost-efficiencies across the system, not being currently investigated by other system-wide groups.

3.1. High potential initiatives:

- A. Supply disk-based temporary data backup between UC library partners to take advantage of systemwide capacity and geographic distribution
 - A pilot project is currently underway.

- ACTION: Adrian will present the conclusions of the pilot project before the end of July.
- B. Helpdesk/ticketing/bug tracking system
 - ACTION: UCB will set up and host a shared pilot of FootPrints (web-based IT ticketing system).
 - ACTION: LTAG will investigate setting up a shared library GitHub instance.
- C. Streaming media infrastructure
 - ACTION: LTAG will develop a statement of best practices for developing media streaming.
 - The use of new tools (HTML 5, CSS3) and services (YouTube) make a streaming media server less necessary.
- D. Regional and/or consolidated technical training
 - ACTION: Each campus will inventory their last 6 months and projected future technical training activities. This will include:
 - i. The type of event.
 - ii. The cost (whether per seat or flat rate fee).
 - iii. Desired training events in the near future.
- E. UC Libraries private cloud
 - ACTION: LTAG will investigate the necessary infrastructure for creation of a UC Libraries private cloud
- F. Library participation in systemwide collocation
 - ACTION: LTAG will investigate what each campus is doing with regard to system-wide data/storage collocation.
- G. Central wiki for group collaboration
 - ACTION: UCSF will investigate its current Confluence capacity and the potential for hosting library system-wide work group wikis (approximately 35 total).
- H. Collaborative software
 - ACTION: LTAG will investigate the benefits of setting up a shared library GitHub instance.

3.2. Low potential initiatives:

- I. Authentication and authorization
 - Shibboleth and the InCommon best practices will create some level of unified authentication. However, the differing campus-wide authorization policies and procedures make this difficult to explore right now.
- J. Security assessment/audit tools
 - This is already handled on a campus level.
- K. Privacy audit tools
 - This is already handled on a campus level.
- L. CRM (Customer Relationship Management)
 - Currently, there is no need or demand for a library CRM system.

4. Announcements & agenda building for next meeting

1. UCSB: is launching a digital collection website for exhibits and display using Omeka.
<http://digital.library.ucsb.edu>.
2. UCSF: is analyzing a proposal to turn the entire library into "Learning Commons".
3. UCB: is building a GIS repository