

Metadata Working Group
October 08, 2013

Agenda

- 1) Announcements/updates (All)**
- 2) Generating and displaying journal citation metadata (Otto/Agnew)**
- 3) Multiple Version Specifications and Guidelines (Otto)**
- 4) Entering dates in WMS (All)**
- 5) Date normalization project update (Gallagher)**
- 6) Customized data entry forms in WMS (Zimmerman/Otto/Gallagher)**

Present: G. Agnew, K. Ananthan (co-chair), M. De Fino, D. Gorman, R. Marker, J. Otto, L. Sun, M.B. Weber (co-chair and recorder), K. White

Excused: I. Beard, C. Radick, C. Zimmerman

1. Announcements/updates- K. Ananthan announced that Ron sent Mary Beth and her an email asking the MDWG to review the proposal to extend DOI metadata to include Resource Type and Description. Ananthan will forward the message to the group for consideration.

2. Generating and displaying journal citation metadata- J. Otto, G. Agnew

Otto and Agnew discussed generating and displaying citation metadata in RUcore. Agnew suggested using descriptive event to map citation metadata from the Faculty Deposit Module. It should look like this:

```
<mods:extension
  <rulib:descriptiveEvent>
    <rulib:type>Citation</rulib:type>
    <rulib:dateTime encoding="journal publication date">journal publication date, e.g., Spring
      2014</rulib:dateTime>
    <rulib:associatedObject>
      <rulib:type>Journal</rulib:type>
      <rulib:relationship>Has part</rulib:relationship>
      <rulib:name>journal title</rulib:name>
      <rulib:identifier type="volume and issue">vol(issue), e.g., 58(1)</rulib:identifier>
      <rulib:reference type="doi">doi, e.g., http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/xxxxxx</rulib:reference>
      <rulib:detail>page range, e.g., 206-232</rulib:detail>
    </rulib:associatedObject>
  </rulib:descriptiveEvent>
</mods:extension>
```

The date associated with journal publication does not (and should not) appear in any of the standard encoding formats. These tend to be written as 'December 2013' or 'Spring 2012.' On the faculty deposit form, depositors are actually prompted to enter that type of non-standard date, and we want that familiar non-standard journal publication date to be mapped over to the

WMS. This will require another option for date encoding. Although it wasn't discussed in the meeting, Otto proposes that we establish a new encoding term 'journal publication date' for descriptiveEvent dateTime. That proposal is reflected in the xml above.

Agnew also noted that under Associated Object in Descriptive event, values in Reference Type pulldown should be changed to match those in the Identifier type pulldown.

Agnew suggested asking C. Mills to investigate using a cite widget to share citations.

She also suggested establishing an events registry to standardize all the types of events that have so far been used. Someone will need to take responsibility for coordinating the registry. Agnew further suggested that someone in MDWG should be responsible for adding controlled vocabulary terms to descriptive event, rather than having people add them as metadata is provided.

3. Multiple Version Specifications and Guidelines- J. Otto

Otto raised questions related to the deposit of multiple version of an article in the Faculty Deposit Module (see attached). The group reviewed each question and provided answers. A descriptive event should be created for each version.

Questions 1 and 4, descriptive event metadata for a superseded version:

Create a descriptive event as follows:

```
<rulib:descriptiveEvent
xmlns:rulib="http://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/schemas/rulib/0.1/metadata.dtd">
  <rulib:type>Superseded version creation</rulib:type>
  <rulib:label>NISO term </rulib:label>
  <rulib:dateTime>Date created</rulib:dateTime>
  <rulib:detail>First sentence from cover sheet explanation of NISO term, e.g., This is the
author's original version of a work, which may or may not have been subsequently published
</rulib:detail>
  <rulib:associatedObject>
    <rulib:type>Journal article</rulib:type>
    <rulib:relationship>is version of</rulib:relationship>
    <rulib:name>Title of article</rulib:name>
    <rulib:detail>Note (see examples below) </rulib:detail>
  </rulib:associatedObject>
</rulib:descriptiveEvent>
```

Examples of notes which would appear in the associated object detail element:

- Superseded by a newer version.
- Embargoed by the author.
- Embargoed by the publisher.

Removed from the repository at the author's request.

Question 2, 'depositing author' as role term:

Yes, 'depositing author' is the appropriate role term.

Question 3, placement of depositing author name, role, and email

This belongs in digiprov metadata. Implement the following changes to digiprov metadata:

1. Define a new digiprov event type 'upload file'
2. Add new associated Entity in digiprov event
3. Define a role element under associatedEntity
4. Define new roles 'depositor' and 'depositing author'
5. If the author deposits his own work, write that author's name, role ('depositing author'), and email to associatedEntity in digiprov
6. If a third party deposits a work on the author's behalf, write the author's name, role ('depositing author'), and email to digiprov, and add a *second* associated entity to describe the third party, with name, role ('depositor') and email address.

Question 5, event elements displayed when user clicks "View all Versions" link

Display label, date, and detail.

Question 6, is Related item necessary since this is a compound object:

Yes, because in future Related item could be used to generate the event. The related item should be abbreviated as follows:

For the Citation descriptive event:

Type=has part
Title=journal title
Don't use identifier

For the Superseded version descriptive event:

Type=other version
Title=article title

Question 7, What is the mechanism to embargo a version?

This is moot. All superseded versions will be unavailable by default.

4. Entering dates in WMS (All)

Anathan explained that although there are three encoding types available in the WMS for all date elements, the WMS validates only w3cdtf encoding. Because there are no validation rules set for ISO8601 and MARC encoding, WMS accepts date input in any format, including non-integer and negative dates. This causes two problems:

- 1) Date sorting in RUCore does not function as expected.
- 2) We are using a DataCite metadata profile for DOI metadata; it requires a date in YYYY format in order for a DOI to be public. If dates are entered in any other format, EZID assigns "reserved" as the DOI state.

We need to address these two issues and to provide a workable solution. MDWG recently worked on cleaning up dates in some resources in several RUCore collections. If these issues aren't addressed, we will need to routinely clean up dates in invalid format.

Marker will ask R. Jantz to draft specifications for validating ISO8601 dates. The group decided to remove MARC encoding for dates. Once the specifications from Jantz are received, MDWG will refer it to CISC for discussion and approval.

5. Date normalization project update (Gallagher) – Tabled.

6. Customized data entry forms in WMS (Zimmerman/Otto/Gallagher) – Tabled.