Present: K. Ananthan (co-chair), I. Beard (via videoconference), M. De Fino, D. Gorman, Y. Lin, R. Marker, J. Otto, C. Radick (recorder), L. Sun, M.B. Weber (co-chair)

Excused: K. White; C. Zimmerman

1. **Announcements**

Yu-Hung Lin, Metadata Librarian for Continuing Resources, Scholarship and Data was welcomed as a new member of MDWG.

2. **Where to record School, Department, and Center for Faculty Deposits (Otto)**

3. **Implementing <name><authority> in WMS (Otto, Ananthan)**

As agenda items 2 and 3 were related, they were discussed together.

J. Otto explained that part of the RUL Open Access implementation will include the ability to browse for faculty deposits by school, department, or center. One logical place to provide this information is in Corporation/Organization name. R. Marker explained that for ETDs, "graduate school" is required information on the ETD form, and is inherited into the WMS.

If different collections use different vocabularies for the academic unit, it would help to have an authority attribute for name, following the model of subject topic. Further, if it's helpful to have a different list for each type of unit ((schools, department, institutes/centers), this would also benefit from an authority attribute.

This led to a discussion about how this would impact the faculty deposit form. When faculty sign in to Faculty Deposit with netID, the system autopopulates the academic unit based on netID, using the LDAP database maintained by OIT. (This leads to problems; for example RUL librarians are listed under their respective units (e.g., TAS), not under Rutgers University Libraries, since it is the individual unit, and not the Libraries, that appears in the LDAP database.) Moreover, faculty collections are organized by departments—as LDAP defines them-- in the WMS and RUcore search portals. The Open Access implementation group can develop an authoritative list of departments, but questions will still remain about who would maintain and manage the list, and how the academic unit information would be supplied, if not from LDAP data derived from netID. It will be necessary to look at the deposit form to see how this will (should) play out. R. Marker reported that there have been concerns raised about the LDAP list; the LDAP fields should be reviewed to see what other fields might be available for autopopulating the form. Dave Hoover will also be consulted as he has previously mentioned that there are additional fields that may be used to provide this information.   R. Marker also suggested setting up a meeting with OIT to discuss LDAP; the University has an LDAP Active Directory Group. K. Ananthan and J. Otto will talk to Tibor about this; any discussion of LDAP might also include discussion of ORCID.

Action Item: K. Ananthan will add a feature request to software.libraries, to add authority attribute to name (both personal and corporate). K. Ananthan said this could be ready for the next software release.

4. Update of WMS Metadata Spreadsheet Status Update- All

K. Ananthan reported she has received input from D. Gorman, J. Otto, and L. Sun since the last MDWG meeting. I. Beard has been charged with reviewing metadata for film and optical disk source types and will report to K. Ananthan at a later date.

R. Marker and K. Ananthan worked on text, and K. Ananthan also reviewed sound. Datasets are an issue because they come in so many formats. It will be best to wait for the Exif tool implementation; at that point background processing and mapping can be done. At worst, we would have mimetype, at a minimum. We might also have to look at how technical metadata is driven. Marker suggested that there should be a data mode for data sets.

Exif and Media information tools can extract technical metadata from a file. Exif is all purpose and can be applied to media for information extracts or rich technical metadata for audio and moving images. These will be used to automatically extract and populate technical metadata and are not a substitute for resource description but rather an enhancement.

5. Review/revise/de-dupe existing genre lists WMS (MBW, KA)

At the Feb. 12 CISC meeting, it was noted that there is some genre term duplication in WMS between different controlled vocabulary lists. G. Agnew directed MDWG to begin a review and cleanup of Genre in the WMS, and provide guidelines on standard vocabularies to be used by catalogers. Also at that CISC meeting, J. Otto presented and reviewed two MDWG recommendations. First, revising the User Account spec in RUcore to employ a single generic citation style for journal articles. Second, since journal articles are not the only resource type in RUcore, reconsidering content model definitions or employing other mechanisms to identify resource types in the repository, in order to formulate an appropriate generic citation. G. Agnew said she is fine with using a generic citation style for web resources, but asked the MDWG to further investigate repository practices, and in particular, whether other repositories were citing the unpublished repository version or the published version not held by the repository, and how these resources were being cited.

G. Agnew and CISC also agreed that genre model was the correct element for identifying resource type, and that a specific authority could be used for this purpose.   The MDWG may ultimately need to develop a genre list for resource type for this use.

However, the repository citations practices question must be settled first. If the resource is a journal article, such as a Submitted Manuscript Under Review (SMUR), should the exported citation be for the Manuscript, or for the published version, which is not held in the repository? If the citation is for the repository version (i.e., an unpublished version, in most cases), there may be little variation between resource types, when it comes to citation format. J. Otto will research current repository practices and

report back to CISC. At that point, the MDWG task (develop a genre list for resource type) may be revisited.

7. Design a Course and Training Materials for Metadata Design and Creation

M.B. Weber reported that G. Agnew made a request at the February 12 CISC meeting for MDWG to design a course of training for metadata design. This will be a subset of A. Morgan's data schedule and she will include a session on metadata design.

8. Research Data Course

M.B. Weber reported that G. Agnew's research data course will be offered again for new hires in the library. G. Agnew asked for input regarding who should attend; L. Sun, C. Zimmerman, C. Radick, and Y.-H. Lin were suggested. M.B. Weber and K. White will teach a session on ontology building in April.

6. Application Profiles (APs)

Application profiles should be made publicly available via the Developer's page. The spreadsheet should include narrative, operating assumptions, etc.

M. De Fino reviewed the AP for exhibition catalogs.   We must be mindful to include technical metadata and a rights statement for each AP.

Action item: R. Marker will work with M. De Fino and update technical and rights MD information in the application profile.