

**Metadata Subcommittee
Conference call
July 9, 2008**

Present on call:

Gail Clement (FIU)

Daniel Cromwell (FCLA)

Emmett Denny (FAMU)

Doug Dunlop (UCF)

Brian Falato (USF)

Helen Laurence (FAU)

Bob Sun (UWF)

Naomi Young (UF)

- 1) Approval of Minutes. Minutes of the June 11 conference call were approved.

- 2) Discussion of Collaboration with DISC.

DISC minutes were not available at our last meeting, so this discussion was tabled until today. Emmett sent out the DISC minutes of 5/14 earlier today.

Gail reported on today's DISC conference call. The "take home message:" The value of collaboration is a given. Both groups need to establish priorities and then we need to determine overlapping areas for collaboration.

New topic introduced at today's DISC meeting: Responding to the need for better coordination among institutions as we decide what to digitize. In the old NOTIS/PALMM days, we could derive records into QF or QC with an 035 TKR to flag the item for digitization at our institutions. In Digitool, there's no way to create a provisional record and mark it to designate intent to digitize. Some aren't using DLU01. For example, FIU is putting everything into Digitool in Dublin Core (DC). There's considerable variation in practices across the state. We don't have the common denominator we used to have in NOTIS with a failsafe to avoid duplication of effort. Today, 2 librarians on DISC mentioned that in Mango there's digitized material showing up that wasn't digitized in FL, and there will be more (GoogleBooks) .

Emmett asked for an example of how such duplication of effort might occur?

Gail: It might not happen much, especially with special collections, ephemera, archival materials, etc. For monographic projects on the other hand, there are plenty of projects where rare monographs are being digitized and this is where duplication might occur. There was a digitization planning group that developed a bibliography of Floridiana to be digitized. But we have no registry of digital books.

Naomi pointed out that there is the Digital Library Federation's Registry of Digital Masters. It's an outside tool (neither Digitool nor DLU01) and FL is not contributing to it, and maybe nobody is; nonetheless, maybe we need to put this on the table. Also, eventually UF will be looking at out of copyright materials in its brittle book project that could well be duplicated elsewhere in other institutions.

Daniel summarized: Looking at collaboration on digital projects across the state, we need a way of identifying what each institution is working on.

There followed a wide-ranging discussion on how this could be done, noting issues such as OPAC display, indexing, merge of records in Union Endeca, title lists on the SWIKI.

Gail reported that Salwa Patel (FAU) and Lee Dotson (UCF), who are collaborating on their Socialist pamphlets collections, have title lists in the thousands, which creates a problem of scale for the SWIKI.

Naomi articulated the general consensus that we want to avoid setting up yet another database.

Gail: Our decision may ultimately be reactive to an outside agency saying funds will be contingent upon implementation of a coordination strategy in place. She predicted that there will be lots of resistance to coordination because of lack of time and resources; e.g. not everyone has the luxury of having a cataloger for digitized resources.

Emmett reviewed past discussions on priorities for coordination, including:
Life events metadata;
Types of descriptive metadata to be implemented in Digitool;
Updating the cataloging access guidelines for electronic resources (CAGER).

Added to that list should be how things are mapped to display. Emmett would like to create a summary of our discussions to share with DISC and then have a joint meeting to determine priorities.

Following an exchange re: what was migrated from QF into DLU01 and what was left behind, we returned to the issue of establishing priorities for collaboration with DISC.

Emmett suggested that life events metadata could be dropped from the list and that we should focus on updating the CAGER guidelines, pointing out that they could now incorporate procedures for coordination of digitization projects.

Emmett asked for clarification of the role of DISC in updating the CAGER guidelines. For example, if DISC looked at new guidelines, we would like them to be able to say: "For this document to be useful, we can supplement and complement as follows:..."

Gail : DISC can look at it through the filter of “What if you don’t use DLU01” and “What if you don’t have a cataloger creating MARC records for your digital resources?” The guidelines can address workflows incorporating MARC, but DISC people also want to know: if you don’t have the luxury of a cataloger, how can you create good records using DC, MODS? With the awareness that we may not be able to always use MARC, how can we still get good subject access and authority control, for example? How can guidelines be extended to that environment?

There was general agreement that updating the CAGER guidelines for 2008-09 would be our top priority for collaboration with DISC.

Emmett will email DISC chair Salwa Patel saying that this is our priority and attaching a copy of the existing CAGER guidelines (rev. July 2003). Also included will be a list of what we understand to be DISC concerns and areas of possible collaboration:

Revision of CAGER guidelines (our top priority)
Metadata mapping
Life cycle metadata
Notification system; Idea of registry

Before sending to Salwa, Emmett will send to CAGER for review. Then if OK, will send to Salwa for distribution to DISC, and will share Salwa’s response w/ the group.

- 3) FCLA Updates (if any). None.
- 4) Open Discussion on Current Concerns. None

Emmett will correct last meeting’s minutes and will submit to Lisa for posting.

We wished Doug Dunlop well in his new position at the Smithsonian as Metadata Librarian working at the National History Museum.

Next meeting: August 13th at 2pm.

The meeting adjourned at 3:11pm.

Submitted by:
Helen Laurence