Metadata Subcommittee
Quarterly Report
August 17, 2007

During the last quarter, two topics have made up most of the discussions: group structure and migration of the PALMM database from NOTIS to Aleph and the Endeca environment.

First, the group has been working on a smooth transition from its existence as CAGER to its new incarnation as the Metadata Subcommittee. A formal request for digital projects members was distributed via the listserv for redistribution to individual libraries. In August, we held our first call as the Metadata Subcommittee. The Subcommittee can potentially have two representatives from each university, one from traditional electronic resource cataloging, the other from digital projects metadata creation. The hope is to have expertise and viewpoints from both areas. However, some universities may choose to appoint only one member to the Subcommittee.

Various voting scenarios were discussed. The following method of voting representation was selected:

> Each university will have two votes on the Metadata Subcommittee. In institutions with two members, each member will have one vote. In institutions with one member, that member has two votes.

The Metadata Subcommittee plans to take up and continue work started in DDAC and CAGER and described in the Metadata Summit Report. One example is the *Life Events Report* issued by a task force working under DDAC. Life events metadata is still in evolution. Currently the Metadata Subcommittee is encouraging interested libraries to proceed with local investigations, but when the full complement of digital projects members is on board, the Subcommittee will consider this project further.

The second major topic addressed by the group concerns the mechanics of using a new Aleph library, DLU01, for PALMM records migrated from NOTIS, and the relationship of DLU01 to DigiTool and Endeca.

Indexing decisions need to be made for DLU01. To avoid confusion, indexes that have the same function as those in the other Aleph bibliographic libraries should have the same labels in DLU01. However, some special indexes may be used to take advantage of special aspects of the PALMM projects metadata. Endeca's need for cross-database consistency should also influence decisions.

There was a lot of discussion about which records would be migrated from NOTIS LTQF to Aleph DLU01. The inzprocess records will migrate with a suppressed status. This will avoid recataloging, but keep records out of public display until the libraries are ready to use or delete them. New records added to claim a work for future digitizing should also have the suppressed status. Since suppressed records will not be seen in the Aleph WebOPAC, anyone who selects content for digitization should have a read-only access to the client so that works already claimed by another library can be avoided.

Individual libraries using DigiTool will need to make case by case decisions about which records should go to Endeca and which should not. The example is given of a large collection of digitized photographs. It would be best for a collection level record to be sent to Endeca rather than including large sets of records with minimal metadata for each image. The collection level record would point back to DigiTool, which has the organization and search tools appropriate to individual photographs.

Future Subcommittee work will involve a strategy for action and the creation of a resource list of standards, best practices and other documents for use by the State University Libraries.

Submitted by:
Kimberly Montgomery
Metadata Subcommittee Chair