Metadata Working Group
Minutes
July 19, 2010


Excused: L. Sun, I. Beard

1. Collection Metadata and Date Specifications
Weber distributed a handout of collection level metadata. The group suggested creating a separate spreadsheet tab for source and rights information. Ananthan recommended the group map the MODS elements to existing source and rights metadata elements and add it to spreadsheet. Weber will post the latest version of the spreadsheet to the group’s Sakai site.

CISC has not reviewed the date specifications documentation. Marker reported that she has consulted with the Faculty and User Services Group and they approved the changes. The date specifications will be sent to CISC for approval.

2. Updates from Cyber Infrastructure Steering Committee (CISC) and Software Architecture Working Group (SW_ARCH)
Marker reported that the CISC team members discussed the goals for next fiscal year. One of the goals of the group is to focus on users and outreach. Agnew, Marker, and Ananthan proposed revising the collection structure and to organize the resources in the repository that is more meaningful to our users. Marker reported that the RUcore open house was a huge success and thanked those who attended.

Marker said that the Jazz Oral History project is postponed. She explained that the size of the digital file is too large to ingest via the WMS. Access is currently restricted to Dana Library and the existing RUcore technology does not support restricting access to a specific location.

3. RUcore Release Schedule
Ananthan gave an overview of the current RUcore Release schedule. SW_ARCH is testing R5.1.2 which includes some updates to statistics package, relationship capabilities in Fedora to support annotation objects, and some WMS changes related to METS-XML. R5.2 is a major release and most of the specifications have been approved by CISC. This release will provide some major changes to WMS, ETD/WMS interface, and enhancement to the MARC Export Utility. Since there are many WMS changes for R5.2, MDWG may have to prioritize them. The specifications are posted in RUcore under the Developer’s Area. A special RUcore release (R5.1.3) is possible for Annotation Tool.

4. Collection Structure and RUcore Search Portals
Marker explained the difficulties with the current collection tree structure. It is getting too long and the collection structure is for the collection creators—not users. There are numerous disparities
between collection structures. Users are currently unable to search everything (RUcore, NJDH, and NJEDL) in the repository. To address this issue, Agnew has proposed for three main portals – Research Data, Scholarship, and Cultural and Historical Heritage. These portals will have unique portal IDS and each collection and resources will be assigned to at least one portal at the time of ingestion. The portal IDs will be used to organize the resources in the repository. A fourth portal will be created for the Collection Owners to manage licensed documents. This portal will not be for end-user searching. This proposal has been approved by CISC and specifications are being written by Ananthan and Marker. The MDWG will retrospectively associate existing resources with portals.

In addition to the above changes, there will be a new option to browse by broad subject terms. A list of terms compiled from Drupal Research Guides was distributed to the group. The group reviewed the terms and feel that we need broader terms so that the list will be short. The group also feels that there may be a gap in the list. Otto will provide a list developed for MIC project with broad subject terms for the group to review.

5. **Expand Owner/Organization Metadata**
Marker and Ananthan explained the need to revise the metadata in WMS for owner/organization. Although the owner/organization metadata record is not ingested into the repository, the metadata is written in the collection object and the resource object. Zimmerman will submit a proposal with the changes to MDWG for approval.

6. **MP4 Video Presentation Format**
Tabled due to Beard’s absence.

7. **RUcore Glossaries**
The existing glossaries are being revised by De Fino and Zimmerman. De Fino is taking the approach to send the revised glossaries to one person at a time for feedback. She will send it to Weber, Marker, and Ananthan in this order. A draft version of the glossaries will be available for September meeting.

8. **Descriptive Metadata Changes in WMS**
Otto brought to the attention of the group that there is no place to put a title as a subject. She will write up the specifications and send it to the group for review.