

CYBER-INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING COMMITTEE (CISC)

Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2011

Present

Grace Agnew, Chair	Rhonda Marker	Gideon Thompson (guest)
Kalaivani Ananthan	Chad Mills	Mary Beth Weber
Isaiah Beard	Aletia Morgan	Ryan Womack
John Brennan	Jane Otto	
Linda Langschied	Tibor Purger	

Excused

Ron Jantz

AUL Update

Agnew welcomed Aletia Morgan, a Research Application Designer who works for Dr. Pazzani, to the group. Her focus is data and she will bring another valuable perspective to the group.

Womack introduced Gideon Thompson. Thompson is the current Diversity Intern from the School of Communication and Information (SCI). In his current rotation he is working with Womack who thought it would be beneficial for him to attend this meeting to gain a broader perspective on data initiatives within the Libraries.

Agnew mentioned Womack has given his first two data presentations. The presentations focus upon elements of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Data Management Plan, RUresearch and how it provides sophisticated contextual presentation of research data and associated documentation, services provided by the RUresearch Data Team, and representation of data in a custom portal. Additional presentations have been scheduled for the afternoons of March 9 and 29. Womack added that good questions were asked by the attendees, many of whom have active data projects.

On March 7 Agnew participated in a conference call with Marianne Gaunt and Lee Williamson from the Rutgers Foundation. Williamson talked about outreach to a New Jersey based business which provides administrative computing services to discuss support for University in computer science-related endeavors. Agnew spoke about workflow and how our focus in this area may tie into this effort. After the conference call a representative from the company followed up with Williamson requesting additional information. Although talk is in the preliminary stages this potential affiliation could be a win-win for both the University and Libraries. Williamson is also working with faculty in Computing Sciences on other potential funding opportunities.

RUcore R5.2 Research Portal Requirements

Marker, Mills and Ananthan reviewed the RUcore R5.2 Research Portal Requirements document for feedback and approval. Portals will provide contextual relationship to the way people discover resources within RUcore. There will be three durable portals: Research Resources, Scholarship, and Cultural and Historical Heritage. There will also be unique portals for each collection owner.

Discussion followed regarding the name of the Cultural and Historical Heritage portal. There was a concern this was too specific and not fully representative of the scope of the material which will be included here. There is an acknowledged need to balance resource owner and resource user perceptions. Everyone will consider and submit alternate names for this portal to Marker.

There was considerable discussion about the default and advanced Search portals, specifically filtered searches. The danger of filtered searches returning zero hits and its impact on repository use was

CYBER-INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING COMMITTEE (CISC)

Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2011

acknowledged. Agnew stressed our metadata and search strategies must be congruent. Mills verified the code for Release 5.2 is due by the end of March, but any changes to the Search page will not take effect until all resources have migrated to the new portals. Additional discussion about Search will take place in future meetings.

The group approved the creation of three main portals and the eventual renaming of the Cultural and Historical Heritage portal. Portal IDs will be set up by the end of March. Weber and her staff will work with Mills to reassign all RUcore resources to one (or more) of these portals. This is due by the end of May.

Requirements for Date Elements

Marker, Mills and Ananthan reviewed the Requirements for Date Elements document for feedback and approval. This spec applies to all dates throughout the metadata. They walked the group through examples of single structured, range of structured, single free text, and range of free text dates. Using this approach will provide more flexibility while also bringing dates in line with MODS. It was noted that dates will be sorted by publication date. There was also a brief discussion about BCE (Before Common Era) dates, but they do not present a pressing priority.

The group approved the proposal and Agnew commended the team on their work.

Context Resource Specification

Agnew reviewed the Context Resource Specification document. She talked about the two types of “meta-resources”, Collections and Portals. Collections are the basic organizing principle for resources placed into RUcore. Portals represent resources which are chosen individually and/or from collections, then displayed through a web portal. Meta-resources provide more context and stronger relationships, allowing them to be used in multiple ways. Examples include Digital Exhibits, Research Projects, Conferences, and Archival Collections. Agnew further walked the group through use case workflow diagrams for Digital Exhibits and Research Projects.

A major goal is event grouping. Event grouping will allow people to specify the order resources appear, along with their hierarchy. An event group will also support three hierarchical levels, an important feature for researchers.

There was discussion about the differences between context and traditional library collections. Relationships and context matter and should be separate. Additionally, the organization of resources in a specific manner is predominant and important.

Next steps include shifting RUcore from the collection paradigm to a relationships paradigm. Mills was asked to closely review the specs to ensure they are congruent with the current direction of the repository. Agnew will attend an upcoming Metadata Working Group meeting to discuss context related metadata.

Submitted by John Brennan
March 16, 2011