

CAGER
Conference Call
Minutes
July 11, 2007

Present on call:

Gail Clement, FIU
Daniel Cromwell, FCLA
Emmett Denny, FAMU
Janice Donahue, FAU
Lee Dotson, UCF
Doug Dunlog, UCF
Catherine Gardiner, FGCU
Helen Laurence, FAU
Yue Li, FSU
Kimberly Montgomery, UCF
Mary Ann O'Daniel, FCLA
Jean Phillips, FCLA
Angela Randtke, UNF
Linda Smith, UNF
Sue Wartzok, FIU
Naomi Young, UF
Ya'aqov Ziso, UNF

While we were waiting for everyone to join the call, Kim asked Daniel about the fix for the 001 that will be needed for Aleph to DigiTool synchronization. However, it is a little too soon for that work yet.

Sue asked whether Priscilla needed a decision from us on whether to move from LTQF to DLU01 in batches or all at once. According to a July 2nd email, the old plan was going to use batches, but the new one would probably move everything at once. Yue wondered how the decision to go with the Aleph v.18 OPAC would affect the schedule for the phase 2 libraries. Naomi suggested that because the Endeca rollout has been delayed and the authorities are not yet up in v.18, and given the many projects vying for FCLA time, there might not be as much urgency to move LTQF to DigiTool. Mary Ann noted that the new retrospective file has been loaded into LCA10 on prod18 and indexing is proceeding. The current plan is that NOTIS will be available until at least the end of the calendar year. Daniel said that we will need to communicate with Priscilla about the schedule.

The proper format for cataloging digitized images of ceramic objects was discussed. One approach is to catalog the collection. Another is to catalog the access interface, treating it

as a database. If individual images are cataloged, the record type can be coded for visual materials while an 006 brings out the electronic resources aspect.

Doug Dunlop, with assistance from Lee Dotson, summarized what had been done that led up to the Life Events Report. So far, approaches to metadata have been localized. The effort was to look for appropriate standards. Encoded Archival Context (EAC) was seen as the best fit, but it still needs more work. There needs to be more investigation into what the needs of the SULs are. So far, UF, FCLA, and UCF, and possibly other libraries, are interested in doing more localized testing. Angela mentioned hearing at ALA that some libraries are using the MARC Format for Community Information. But nationally, efforts are still localized. DigiTool does not currently handle EAC because it is still in development.

Kim asked whether the current group consisting of CAGER members should wait to discuss further action until it had reformed as the Metadata Subcommittee with new digital projects metadata members. Gail noted that the Life Events Report was unfinished business from the former DDAC. It was just one instance of many such efforts made by that group. DDAC had many temporary interest groups that were formed to handle specific issues, then broke up when the work was done. Perhaps this model should be used as part of the new structure of the Metadata Subcommittee. Specific decisions about structure will have to wait until the new members are on board.*

Kim will send out an email to CAGER members asking them formally to go back to their institutions and get nominations for digital projects metadata members of the new subcommittee. Daniel will solicit a new FCLA member from the group working with the digital library.

The Metadata Subcommittee will have two members from each university. One member will be from traditional cataloging; the other member will be from digital projects metadata creation. Voting representation was discussed. The options were:

1. One vote per university
Each university would be equally represented, but if two members from a university could not come to agreement, then this would create internal strife and a need to seek a resolution from someone in a higher position.
2. One vote per member
This creates an inequality amongst universities for voting. Institutions with two members would get more votes than institutions with one member.
3. Two votes per university
Each university would be equally represented. In institutions with two members, each would have a vote. In institutions with one member, that one member would have two votes. However, that gives the single members a lot of relative voting power per person.

After much discussion, option 3 was adopted. Each university will have two votes on the Metadata Subcommittee. They are split between two members if the institution has two members. If the institution has only one member, that member holds both votes.

Ya'aqov noted that Angela is leaving so UNF will be replacing her member position and will soon be adding another digital projects member, giving two people for UNF's two votes.

Since the Metadata Subcommittee will not be a separate group, but be created from the CAGER group, Naomi suggested that she ask Rich Bennett to inactivate the MetaSumm listserv. This would retain existing archives while denying new posts. The CAGER listserv cannot be renamed, but its label may be changed. We will look into that after all members are on board because we do not want to cause confusion during the time that people are signing up.

Again, Kim will send out an official request for new digital projects metadata members to be nominated for each university. This official request sent through the CAGER listserv will then be archived. Kim will also send new members a message about the new Metadata Subcommittee with instructions for signing up to the CAGER listserv and for getting their names added to the member list on the website.

Kim will send an email to Chuck Thomas telling him that UCF, UF, FCLA and other libraries are encouraged to go ahead with local investigations for the life events standard, with the understanding that the Metadata Subcommittee may ask that work be refocused. The current members of CAGER would like to get the digital projects metadata people on board before making large decisions about future directions.

*Editor's addition from the CSUL Minutes of May 31, 2007:

10. TSPC Reports

C - CAGER Subcommittee Report – The subcommittee recommended that the CAGER Subcommittee evolve into the new Metadata Subcommittee that would include former CAGER members along with digital projects metadata creators from each university. – approved

D - MetaData Subcommittee Charge was approved with the caveat that some institutions might only have one member and not two.