MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: February 5, 2009	Project	: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Becca Cavell	Job No.	: THA Project 0810
Re	: Informatics Visioning Meeting		

Present:

University of Oregon
John Conery - CSI
Patrick Phillips - Biology
Chuck Theobald - LCNI
Andrzej Proskurowski – Computer Science
Matt Sottile – Computer Science
Allen Malony – C&IS, NIC
Jolinda Smith – LCNI
Scott Frey – LCNI / Psychology
Erik Johnsen - Biology
Deb Carver – UO Libraries
Marina Guenza – Chemistry
Jim Hutchison, Chemistry
Brian Westra, - UO Libraries
Ray Frey – Physics
Bruce Bowerman – IMB
Anthony Hornof – CIS
Patrick Philips – Biology
Ulrich Mayr - Psychology

UO Campus Planning
Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng

Consultants
Chuck Cassell, HDR, lab planning principal
Regina Filipowicz, HDR, lab planner
Becca Cavell, THA project manager

Summary Notes

1.1 After introductions, a project overview briefing, and short discussion, Jim asked the group to consider the VISION for the informatics program in the new building, and how it can serve the entire UO science community, and raised a series of issues:
- What is the future of the library?
- What are the implications of off-site computation?
- What about bioinformatics?

1.2 John talked about Informatics as the glue that can hold the various parts of LIBS together. Computer models could be used across disciplines, and Informatics has the potential to bring people together collaboratively in a physical environment – a “place to go”. Other ideas include a help desk, project incubator, a visualization lab.

1.3 Patrick noted that computing resources used to be centralized but now it is diffuse

1.4 Fred talked about “peopleware” vs “hardware”, and the possibility that the hardware side could be located off-site. Matt asked how students who need to work on the hardware side would access the equipment; Fred maintained that the program should distinguish between people space and machine space.

1.5 The committee discussed how data assets are currently managed on campus and it was noted that the UO is working to change the current approach which is decentralized and antiquated.. Who curates the system?

1.6 Al described NIC’s integration into BBMI and the four staff with “core competencies” who are vital to NIC and who could also be available to a broader community.

1.7 How can a project oriented, computation & information center engage the scientific community?

1.8 Patrick noted that Biology is currently understaffed in the field of informatics but that this must change – genomics / bioinformatics office is planned.

1.9 John hopes that other departments in LISB will have computing needs.

NOTE: Attention Attendees! Please review these notes carefully as they will form the basis of future work on this project. If you feel that anything is incorrect or incomplete, please call the author at 503·227·1254.

1.10 Jolinda asked why she would go to Informatics if the center of gravity for her work is LCNI. Al asked if she might ever need help developing algorithms or simulations. Scott noted that LCNIs work would benefit from better / faster computer resources and asked if this new building could be the conduite to bring these together; he noted that the issue is more complex than can be addressed by architecture – it is a sociological issue.

1.11 Bruce noted that Biology's computer expert would prefer to be with a peer group as part of Informatics, and that collaborations could grow simply out of these connections as it would pull biologists over to the hub.

1.12 Patrick noted that interactions will primarily be between graduate students and post-docs. They will come together to share and learn – it won't be an information ghetto.

1.13 Erik asked if Computer Science had a person to support this function. Scott asked for realism regarding function, noting that every department is overworked and underfunded. CS isn't offering to become technicians for LISB.

1.14 Marina noted that while not part of LISB she would love a place to come together collaboratively with other faculty.

1.15 Al talked about the "Cyberlab" – a place for brainstorming, prototyping, visualization, results analysis – this is a place where many disciplines can collaborate together. Marina noted that this would help build bridges, and Al noted that the original proposal asked for significantly more space than is currently allocated. Andrzej noted that this would be a place where synergies are created and practiced.

1.16 Patrick noted that non- LISB scientist may have more need for Informatics services than proposed tenants.

1.17 Becca suggested that in addition to all the features currently described for the "Cyberlab", the room could also function as a high-end video conferencing space. This would support the sustainable goals of UO as it could reduce travel needs.

1.18 Bruce asked if graduate students could also be located in the hub - the science complex may be better served this way.

1.19 Fred is leading the server facility discussion for LISB. Rich Linton's opinion is needed regarding a proposed Tier 3 facility; Patrick proposed that UO needs a centralized, shared node that is STAFFED.

1.20 Fred asked if Informatics needed a physical space – it would be a pity to make something that wouldn't be used; would opening up to allows views INTO the space help? Deb asked if the reason that the current Visualization lab is underused is because it seems "owned" by Computer Science. Matt talked about storefront informatics versus evangelical informatics.

1.21 Erik mentioned USC's Molecular Biology building which integrates Informatics. Al noted that other Universities have supported and integrated approach, and noted that most of what does exist had been driven by research grants.

1.22 Bruce suggested developing the Computer Science space in flexible building space that can adjust in both area and function over time – developing an Informatics center gradually through nucleation might be the most successful approach.

1.23 Patrick noted that bioinformatics would be a service to support genomics, and that genetics is an obvious service-oriented, information-based approach.

1.24 Chuck believes that the Visioning room will be a successful and useful space; the service center can be considered a separate program component. He asked if advertizing the presence of the service might be part of the solution. The problems associated with limited use of the current Visioning space were discussed.

1.25 The group discussed the need for SOCIAL space, and Jim noted that he believes that the visualization space; especially with a cyber-connection for remote conferencing, will be very appealing. The computational side is less clear.

1.26 The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

END OF NOTES

NOTE: Attention Attendees! Please review these notes carefully as they will form the basis of future work on this project. If you feel that anything is incorrect or incomplete, please call the author at 503·227·1254.