

Cyamus Regional Group of IAMSLIC
Cyamus Conference: a Spring Rebirth

San Pedro, California
March 21-24, 2007

Meeting Highlights – a Summary

The Cyamus 2007 meeting commenced on Wednesday, March 21, with a welcome reception at the San Pedro Crowne Plaza Hotel, and was followed by a tour of the Cabrillo Aquarium and a late night Grunion run at the beach.

On Thursday, March 22, the meeting started with a welcome from Larry Fukahara, the programs director of the Cabrillo Marine Aquarium. The morning was dedicated to attendees sharing their institutional updates. Lunch was at the San Pedro Salt March.

CAS UPDATE:

Harold Myers gave the CSA update. Brief summary of update: CSA purchased ProQuest's "Information & Learning" division, not all of ProQuest. New in the Natural Sciences: Environmental Impact Statements, full text resource. COS funding opportunities via the Community of Science, which is supplied to campus research administration offices. There were 14 new journals added to ASFA, and several new ASFA partners. The new CSA Illumina look will have a "Funding" tab at the top, and will have customizable interface. The usage reports are updated frequently, but not daily. Harold presented a demonstration film on CSA's new database of figures and illustrations "Illustrata". Illustrata works in conjunction with other databases, subscribers to other databases can get a 30% discount for Illustrata. Suggestion to Harold that Illustrata pricing should be tiered, depending on institution size, and not same fixed rate (\$14,900) for all.

SCIENTIFIC PRESENTATION:

The Invited Speaker was David A. Caron, Professor of Biological Sciences, Marine Environmental Section, USC. His talk was "Harmful Algae Blooms Nationally and Locally".

Friday, March 23, started out by completing all institutional updates, then moved to discussion of IAMSLIC Restructuring:

Discussion started out with a reminder that this new structure is a 2-year pilot, and this makes it important to sign up, i.e. designate your primary regional group when renewing or revising IAMSLIC membership information. Under this new structure 70% of membership dues collected go back to the regional groups, with an additional allocation for developing countries. After 2008 there will be a re-evaluation to see how the new structure is going and if any changes are needed. Steve commented that regional groups could choose to have a more formal structure if they want to, with a treasurer, secretary, etc. (Amy liked that idea – but no formal proposal for new structure for Cyamus was discussed, status quo seen as fine for now). Barb stated that there was no rule that a regional group had to take all the money that was allocated to them. So far the procedures and processes were reported as working well. Question posed to the group: what kind of projects were members thinking of funding: e.g. digitization, scanning equipment, access to Oregon grey literature, Salmon administration report (massive report that may not be digitized by NOAA), subsidized shipping for duplicates. Joe suggested that the unused funds from our allocation be given back to IAMSLIC, and also put out a call for those who could not make the meeting, to see if they have topic ideas, or unique collections for digitization, and to see if they need equipment or student help for any digitization projects. Attendees were in agreement that we would need to specify to funding recipients that the digitized content must be put in the Aquatic Commons. Suggestion from Janet for a project to do assessments or surveys, for example what is considered core material for North America, and then get a library school student to work on the project. Another idea was for travel support for the representative to attend IAMSLIC meetings. Mention was made that the Pisces Publication Project could be viewed as candidate for addition to the Aquatic Commons. Which brought about the idea of using our allocation to fund travel for the Pisces Project representative. Joe suggested a scenario where matching funds could be given to an institution to buy a scanner, and in return digitized documents that the group agrees would benefit many, and would be added to the Aquatic Commons. The institution given funding for digitization has to at least agree to a minimum number of pages, or documents, to digitize. Agreement that items appropriate for the Aquatic Commons would get first priority. The Cyamus representative distributed the annual plan (request for funding) that was submitted to IAMSLIC Executive Board. Discussion on areas to amend the plan, e.g. request funding for the representative to attend IAMSLIC meetings, to cover registration expenses, and funding for digitization projects, with our priority being to add content to the Aquatic Commons. A project idea was to fund a scanner for Catalina to assist with their thesis digitization project, and have that content added to the Aquatic Commons. (Note: the amended plan was submitted for IAMSLIC Board approval on April 9, 2007, approved June 13, 2007).

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

(Note: the Topics were discussed in order of importance to members present, before discussion started members voted on each topic to help prioritize which would be discussed first, and the following order of topics was determined by attendee votes).

3. Using Web 2.0 tools: RSS, Blogs, Wikis, etc.: Questions & Successes.

Sally started out the discussion by reporting that she used Instant Messaging (IM) for users in her liaison areas, but only had a few contacts communicate with her using IM. Sally uses RSS feeds, and they are used as alerting tools by some databases, instead of the email alerts, and also used by RefWorks (bibliographic management tool). She does demonstrate RSS feeds to users and will be offering a class on “current awareness” using RSS feeds. She creates feeds using “del.icio.us”. Idea for Cyamus: that we could have a news feed for west coast news, items of regional interest, etc. Sally uses Google’s “Co-op” feature and created a “go fish” utility to search reputable fisheries sites. Sally will be creating a blog for her biology students. All of Sally’s uses of these tools are for her outreach efforts to her patrons.

Steve commented that one piece of the Web 2.0 is the social aspect, where users post information for others to add to, e.g. putting up a user guide on a wiki and allowing others to add to it or edit & make changes. Janet mentioned that she thinks of the Web 2.0 as more socializing tools and thus harder to use. Sally elaborated on her project of monitoring Science News and tagging stories on fisheries using del.icio.us. Question about where to find a list of Web 2.0 tools, Steve responded by citing an article titled “Library 2.0 in 15 minutes a day”.

Janet mentioned that she uses wikis for collaborative writing projects, and used Blog Lines for her RSS reader. Joan asked if these tools were used only for undergraduate students or other users. Peter commented that he had never heard of a measure of effectiveness, and the need to hear if it’s worth the effort. Janet stated that she targets faculty and administrators with RSS feeds because they complain about too many emails.

Note: after the meeting Joe emailed some relevant URLs from our discussion, copied below:

Library 2.0 in 15 Minutes a Day
http://instructionwiki.org/Library_2.0_in_15_minutes_a_day

Google coop lets you set up a set of resources that get searched (quality control)
<http://google.com/coop/cse/>

delicious social bookmark

<http://del.icio.us/>

Front end for Instant Messaging

<http://wwwm.meebo.com>

6. Coastal gray literature, archiving and OCR, and institutional repositories as a collection development tool.

Barb and Janet reported that they were gathering regionally relevant literature, verifying citations, plus adding the gray literature documents that are relevant to the OSU project "Oregon Explorer". They are using Dspace with considerable metadata, and are also using the same data dictionary. Both of them are actively inputting their documents into the repository. Barb scans her documents in-house and Janet sends her documents to main campus for scanning. They have different commitments from their different institutions. They posed a question to the group about working cooperatively when you have different institutional support. Discussion of the need to have commitment from library administration to support digitization and repository projects. General discussion from attendees on various digitization projects: Deb reported that she had help from her IT department for bibliography conversion, and then sent it on to her director. With director's buy-in and IT support projects are more successful. Need for a plan to decide what items to scan, e.g. institutional newsletters, bulletins, reports, etc. Selecting what to digitize becomes collection development, and a tool to build and strengthen collections.

The official IAMSLIC harvester is Aveno (spelling?), you need to make sure your institution's items can be harvested by it. Idea to put your scanned items in specific collections, in Dspace, and map to them, then they can be harvested (for use in repository).

Strategies: start with a bibliography of the items you would like to digitize. Comment that it would be good to have an accessible place to put the list of items that you are planning to digitize, or looking for in digital format, for all to access this list.

Janet and Barb concluded by mentioning that their project was not exclusively gray literature, but a large part of it was.

Cyamus Representative Report.

Annual Plan was handed out (approved amended plan attached). Pam Olson is our representative on the IAMSLIC Site Selection Committee.

Discussion on possible locations for the Cyamus March 2008 meeting. First choice was Friday Harbor, University of Washington (Maureen Nolan confirmed location after meeting).

(Discussion topics continued)

5. Looking at Cyamus Geographical Lines.

Reminder that for IAMSLIC membership the members are allowed to select only one primary group, and that group is where the membership dues' money is allocated. Janet reported that the IAMSLIC Membership Committee was charged to look at the freshwater/aquarium groups issue.

Decision & group consensus that the Cyamus geographical lines should remain as is for now.

2. Working with IT departments to have a library component for environmental data collected locally.

Deb reported that their data sets have to go to NOAA. The Long Term Ecological Reserve (LTER) has a mandate to keep their data, long term, on their website. Group consensus was that most libraries were not collecting data, only some were collecting historical data for archival reasons.

9. Bringing the Cyamus website into the 21st century – any volunteers to take over hosting, maintenance, redesign?

Steve posed the question about the Cyamus website, should we continue to maintain it? Attendees present at meeting did state that they used the website, especially the list of member libraries and the links to their catalogs. Discussion on having shared responsibility for content, currency, links, etc. Deb Losey volunteered to update the website and to send out a message to all Cyamus members asking them to send her any changes (Joe sent out the message during the discussion).

4. How to combat that “everything is on the web” philosophy.

Deb mentioned that her scientists demand all documents in PDF, and some assume that all information is on the web. Discussion on coping strategies. Idea to have a poster/sign or flow chart in your library about which databases/electronic content and years are actually online, what part of the collection is in paper format, with a note to “ask a librarian” for clarification. Item during discussion of unique print collections: OSU has a competitive travel grant for their

researchers who want to visit collections in other states or countries.

OPEN DISCUSSION TIME:

Larry, speaking with his IAMSLIC Resource Sharing Committee hat on, posed a question to the group on having guidelines for reimbursement offering, if this was to be supported by IAMSLIC. Discussion followed with idea to identify the items that are requested often, or that are hard to find, then these items will be priorities for including in the Aquatic Commons.

Another discussion topic: NSF was asking people to measure the scientific “worth” of a research vessel. Discussion that NSF should insist on metadata requirements, e.g. the need to have the research vessel’s name included in the reports and publications. For such information, Joan currently identifies people in the ship log at voyage time period and then locates the research publications by using Scopus, she is only doing around 5 years at a time. Question was posed: how do we force the capture of that information, vessel name, etc. for publication.

Discussion ended and meeting was adjourned and all moved to join tours of Aquarium.