

Metadata Subcommittee

Minutes

September 10, 2008

Present on call:

Lu Ai (FCLA)
Daniel Cromwell (FCLA)
Emmett Denny (FAMU)
Brian Falato (USF)
Catherine Gardiner (FGCU)
Yue Li (FSU)
Jim Michael (USF)
Kimberly Montgomery (UCF)
Mary Ann O'Daniel (FCLA)
Jean Phillips (FCLA)
Tamara Weatherholt (FSU)
Naomi Young (UF)

CSUL meeting update: Emmett attended the recent Council of State University Libraries (CSUL) meeting where he reported that Naomi is incoming chair and that we are still considering a vice-chair. The Technical Services Planning Committee (TSPC) and others such as the Collections Planning Committee proposed that there be a face to face meeting with CSUL. CSUL approved a meeting that would include current and incoming chairs. Others might attend via remote conferencing. The meeting will probably be held in Gainesville this November. Everyone who attends should be conversant with the single bib record. Emmett will forward the TSPC's analysis of the single bib record along with Michele Newberry's written comments regarding FCLA's involvement and issues.

Naomi had posed two questions that were previously forwarded to the list by Emmett. First, can MARC records for non-PALMM projects be added into DLU01? Jim asked whether the proposed records were electronic and whether they were for open-access works? Since DLU01 records show in everyone's catalogs in Mango, the works described by these records should be accessible to anyone. Lu noted that the consensus of the Metadata Summit was that all MARC records for digital works be included in DLU01. The group agreed to this.

The second question concerned what editing, if any, should an institution do to a record input by another institution. The specific example was a record for an integrating resource that was a cooperative project by several institutions, some not part of the State University Libraries group. In the past we had had an agreement, that a library that notices that a record needs correction, should inform the inputting library, which would handle it. It was noted that previous records in PALMM had been for stable works such as monographs that were digitized and cataloged once. Records for changing works,

e.g., the collection level record for a changing project, might need other rules. Perhaps in the future, the guidelines should address the policies and etiquette for such situations. Also, once the single bib record goes into effect, there are sure to be rules for how records get edited after they have been contributed to the database. In the interim, until we have addressed this in our guidelines, we should continue to contact the inputting institution with a request that either that library make the change or that it give permission for the reporting library to make updates.

Emmett has received an email from Salwa Patel, the chair of the Digital Initiatives Subcommittee (DISC), expressing an interest in collaboration between the two groups. DISC will discuss the *CAGER Guidelines* and provide feedback.

Lu gave an update on the DISC call that occurred just before the Metadata Subcommittee call. DISC sees a real and immediate need for Dublin Core (DC) guidelines. Their projects with DigiTool are moving forward. DISC will review DC guidelines that already exist elsewhere. Some SULs do have local DC instructions, which the group would like to put on a wiki. They have proposed the creation of a small subgroup to create the SUL-wide guidelines. Lu, Salwa Patel and Lee Dotson have volunteered from that group. If someone from the Metadata Subcommittee would like to join the DISC group, Salwa should be informed. DISC would also like to create a wiki for updating guidelines for creating MARC. DISC would also like to join the next Metadata Subcommittee call briefly to coordinate assumptions and timelines.

The Metadata Subcommittee next began discussions of the *CAGER Guidelines*. These were written in the context of NOTIS, with specific procedures for getting preliminary records into LTQF, for actions FCLA would take on the records, and for final editing by catalogers. *CAGER* had originally started with specific guidelines for specific projects, then moved to the creation of an overarching document that would forestall the necessity of creating new guidelines for every new project.

After much discussion, it was proposed that the goal should be the creation of a unified document that addressed MARC, Dublin Core and possibly other schema. The document should create guidelines that encourage the interoperability of data across the SULs. The guidelines should include best practices for deciding when and how to use MARC, Dublin Core or other metadata coding systems as well as best practices for the selection of appropriate thesauri for describing digital works. While supporting the desired seamless presentation of resources in a shared environment, the guidelines should not prevent the use of metadata appropriate to digitization projects. It was proposed that there be one joint group made up of some members of both DISC and the Metadata Subcommittee that would work with equal participation to create this document.

The need for a vice-chair was discussed. Co-chairing was suggested as a way to encourage people to take on this responsibility without being overwhelmed.

NEXT CONFERENCE CALL: October 8, 2008

Recorder: Kimberly Montgomery