Library Technology Advisory Group

Telephone Conference Call Meeting Minutes
Friday - March 13, 2009

Call to order

Declan Fleming (Chair) called to order the meeting of the Library Technology Advisory Group at 2:03 p.m. on 3/13/09 by way of ReadyTalk telephone conference call.

Roll call

The following persons were present:
- UC San Diego - Declan Fleming (chair)
- UC Berkeley - Lynne Grigsby
- UC Irvine – Adrian Petrisor
- UC Los Angeles - Vicki Terbovich
- UC Merced – Emily Lin
- UC Riverside - Terry Toy
- UC Santa Barbara – Ana Fidler
- UC Santa Cruz – Eric Mitchell
- UC San Francisco – Ann Dobson
- CDL – John Ober
- SOPAG – Diane Bisom

The following persons were absent:
- UC Davis – Dale Snapp
- LAUC – Sue Perry

Open Issues

1. Teleconferencing

> LTAG was charged to investigate teleconferencing options and what might work best. What are other people getting asked? How can we help SOPAG?

> UCLA – Investigating Microsoft Office communication server product. Had a meeting with Microsoft Friday and they offered to bring together a subset of office communication products. They offer desktop video conferencing. 100 clients

then do pilot for UC libraries. Release II is out and bugs are fixed. Staff was interested as well as UCLA University Librarian.

UCI – UCOP's VP of Finance recently appointed a team to investigate video and web conferencing system wide solutions. Jacob Godfrey from UCI coordinates "UC Videoconference Sourcing Team", which focuses on videoconferencing. . Declan mailed Jacob and he is out until April 1st.

Declan mentioned that there is conference provider that might be helpful known as ReadyTalk. At this point, it is not clear if everyone at all campuses uses it and/or if there is a license for it. People have been using audio only for a while and ReadyTalk offers additional features such as web conferencing. We will need to identify what is quick and close at hand as well as a substitute because there might be something more superior. John Ober suggested that we look at this and other tools available quickly, and make recommendations quickly. On the other hand, trying to understand all conferencing product features will take a long time.

SOPAG – Would like to make it as easy as possible. Working with what we have and doing away with specialized equipment would be ideal as long as we have the flexibility of coming together while working from many locations.

UCI - Most campuses have Polycom phones, but not sure if this is the most effective way when working with many people at many places. Small intra-campus teams use it constantly at his library but not sure if they can be set up between various campuses. Some features are basic and some might require a technician depending on functionality.

CDL - Lots of committee work with LTAG and feels like there is a move toward ReadyTalk with web features. A Polycom phone requires that you eventually dial into ReadyTalk. Provided that there are several scenarios and products that develop over time, John Ober suggested that it would make sense to separate this discussion into two for short term urgency versus continuous.

ACTION: Declan will look more into ReadyTalk and its features and gather information about how it is licensed within UC. He will break this down into 1) Short term solutions (gathering as much tutorial info about ReadyTalk to help people get started quickly – Declan may need some help framing all of this) 2) How deep we should go/is it simple?

2. Budget

At the last face to face meeting, there were plenty of things regarding budget that were underway. How are people doing? Can we help? Any good ideas out there for "doing more with less"?

UCSD – Gave back one-time money to handle campus short falls. Analyzing permanent budget for changes next FY.

UCSC – Budget issues are conflicting with all strategic planning so it's a stressful environment to figure out how it's working together. Bottom line is that it is coming down to "there is no money".

CDL – From an infrastructure viewpoint, they are looking at support contracts going from gold to silver levels. Also looking into stretching computer replacement cycles. Not sure how bad it will be next year.

UCB – Looking into open source software for their contracts. Evaluating to see if they can move off license resources. The good news is that because of Millennium they had to upgrade a number of PC's because of the client. Berkeley is also looking at cutting desk phone cost. Most people use email and/or the web for communication.

UCR – No computer upgrades; taking care of only those absolutely necessary. There are no funds and the three year computer cycle is currently on hold. They completed a phone inventory and are working toward making phone changes to decrease the cost.

UCSB – This year they had a 10% budget cut. Staff are being relocated within the library building in preparation for a future

library addition/renovation. As a result of the relocation, they are currently in the process of consolidating functions, moving the server room and going to less expensive hardware. They are also reviewing maintenance contracts and trying to find cheaper alternatives.

UCI – This year they had a 10% budget cut and another 10% is estimated for next fiscal year. UCI is not on a fixed replacement cycle for desktops but they will be replaced less often than usual. They are relying on virtualization for servers and trying not to replace but instead virtualize as much as possible. They are also cutting telephone expenses by disconnecting phone lines and starting to use Skype for calls instead of regular landlines.

UCSF – Ann added that she feels this is the worse budget crisis than anything as it is more severe and will be longer lasting than before. The actual budget cuts feel more severe than the number. She was told to look into possibly an 8% - 11% cut which could mean lay-offs.

SOPAG – Diane agrees that it's the worst and that it's going to take a number of years to recover from.

3. Future Meetings
   Should we even try to have a face to face meeting this year? Suggestions?

   UCB – Voted no as it will be hard to justify the cost for a face to face meeting.

   UCSB – Voted no for face to face meetings. This will keep the cost down.

   UCI –Voted no; don't have the funds

   UCSC – Voted no

   CDL – John suggested that LTAG leave room for a possible face to face meeting for subset group/taskforce maybe with an eye toward making it regional.

UCB – Lynne suggested setting up a number of phone conference meetings in advance. By doing so, it will take 1 to 2 hours as opposed to meeting face to face and that taking up at least a 6 hour block of time.

ACTION: Declan will schedule phone conference meetings to take place once every two months for 1.5 hours.

4. Libraries IT Projects Lists

Declan sent out an example IT Libraries projects list. LTAG was asked to submit something similar that details what their respective libraries are doing amongst each other and share it with sister campuses to collaborate a little better as there is value in having a list like this. Thoughts/how to move forward /is it a bad idea?

UCR – Working on a projects list similar to the example. The difference is that they don't have the list available outside of their network.

UCLA – Vickie looked at the example and found it to be very helpful mostly because she is new. Having looked at the example, it helped her put things in prospective and see where there might be opportunities for collaboration. UCLA is currently using Confluence for documentation.

UCI – Has projects list that contains links to project status and is available internally for library staff. He will put something together based on that list and share with LTAG next week.

UCSF – Mentioned that this is a great idea as long as it's in one place.

UCB – Lynne voted that we make a list where all can host and have one central place with links that gets updated regularly.

ACTION: LTAG members will submit link to whatever libraries projects they have in place. Submit before next meeting. The goal is a snapshot in time.

5. LTAG and UCTrust/Shibboleth

UCTrust/Shibboleth vague and unspecific? How might LTAG work together to make it better understood?

CDL - Characterized from system wide point of view. UC Trust says we don't know what the requirements might be so how can we help? Is it fully deployed? Is it time to ask for help? Can LTAG break that jam? Maintain an IP list for authentication? There is a standing assignment from SOPAG as to what does it take to have traction. UC Trust meeting coming up. John can attend.

ACTION: John will send mail to LTAG to get this discussion going. This will be the top agenda item for next meeting.

New business

None

Adjournment

- Declan Fleming adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m.
- Minutes submitted by: Michelle Harris, Administrative Assistant – UCSD Libraries
- Minutes approved by: Declan Fleming, IT Department Head, LTAG Chair – UCSD Libraries