MINUTES
Metadata Working Group
April 21, 2014

Present: K. Ananthan (co-chair), I. Beard, M. Gallagher, Y.-H. Lin, R. Marker, J. Otto (recorder), C. Radick, L. Sun, M.B. Weber (co-chair), K. White, C. Zimmerman, G. Agnew (for items 1 and 2)

Excused: M. De Fino

1. Descriptive event and related item. This policy discussion, led by G. Agnew, originated in questions about the display issues, definitions, and conceptual bases of related item and event. A summary of this discussion is attached. Following the policy discussion, it was noted, in answer to a question, that there are some display issues with related events that will eventually need to be addressed. For example, an administrative document, described in a rights event and linked via Related Item, will be linked on the landing page for the main resource. Ideally, we would not be displaying links to related resources from any metadata except descriptive. We lack a way to display this information to RUcore administrators; we need an administrators' portal. For the time being, the current approach is the best interim solution.

2. ORCID ID mapping. K. Ananthan presented the R7.4 Specification for ORCID ID implementation prepared by J. Otto and her, based on G. Agnew's recommendations; see attached. The specification was approved. A new policy was approved wherein the ORCID form of name should take precedence over the LCNAF form of name for researchers. Metadata managers should be notified and documentation updated. G. Agnew and the MDWG proposed waiting before adding ORCID to the ETD submission form.

3. Updating Existing Faculty Deposit Metadata. J. Otto presented a specification for revising metadata on existing faculty deposits to enable implementation of displays recommended by the Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group; see attached. R. Marker provided sample policies from Springer, Elsevier, and Taylor & Francis to show the types of notes required by these publishers. The discussion resulted in the following modifications (revised version attached):

1. Added general instructions at the top specifying how to identify the faculty deposits to process

2. Removed the original no. 7, meaning we'll keep that whole "Version identification" note, since it's required by the publisher (even though it may be somewhat redundant, and sometimes conflict with the NISO version language); if this creates issues in displays, we can address those at the point we configure the displays.

3. Changed no. 11 to say remove Related Item (type="has part") for the published version described in Descriptive Event, based on Grace's instructions today (because it is not held in the repository).

4. Added list of NISO JAV Version Terms as last page, with instructions for what to do when the deposit is not a journal article

Since the objective is to have the revised metadata ready when the new search and display functionalities are put in place September 1, M. Gallagher will start processing these records as a pilot, beginning shortly. He will notify R. Marker and J. Otto of any issues, and determine how long it takes per record, for planning purposes, should it prove possible to share or hand off the work. K. Ananthan will authorize Matt for access to the faculty collections in WMS.

4. Adding schools, departments, and centers in WMS. J. Otto and K. Ananthan gave a brief update from discussions with C. Mills and Y. Yu about the planned browse searches on these entities. Centers and institutes will not be included in searches, since the names must be derived from LDAP and the LDAP database isn't current for these bodies.   J. Otto and K. Ananthan will be conducting tests to verify the correct WMS coding for these entities.

5. Digital exhibitions. C. Radick has some questions about digital exhibitions, and may consult with R. Marker. The MDWG expressed interest in discussing this as a group as well.

The remaining agenda items were tabled due to time constraints, and will be added to the next meeting agenda:

- Proposal to implement projection metadata
- Metadata spreadsheet update
- Tasks in software.libraries

USE OF DESCRIPTIVE EVENT AND RELATED ITEM
G. Agnew Policy Discussion at Metadata Working Group, April 21, 2014

Note: In this document, 'Related Item' (caps) refers to the MODS metadata element of that name, or a resource tagged as such. The phrase 'related item' (lower case) denotes related resource, in the generic sense.

INTRODUCTION

Descriptive events and related items are very closely related to each other, but they serve different purposes. To relate repository resources to one another, Fedora uses a strategy called RELS-EXT, which is an RDF statement. A mechanism is necessary to trigger that RELS-EXT, and in RUcore, that mechanism is (or will be) the Related Item field. So when something is in the Related Item, it will be automatically linked to the item that's being described, through that Related Item. (However, right now, we are not able to automatically create the RELS-EXT with Related item; the relationships are manually created using DLR/Edit.) For the most part, Related Item is a mechanism to create linkings, and as such, it is generally not displayed in the metadata.

Descriptive Event adds life cycle context to the resource, and often refers to a related item. The event defines the nature of the relationship, and supplies the who, what, when, where and why that contextualizes the related item. The ultimate goal is use the RELS-EXT relationships to build visual context maps that show how repository resources interrelate, particularly for complex resources like research data, which have multiple relationships. (We'll be doing this for the first time when we ingest EAD finding aids into the repository.)

Thus it is important, whenever possible, to have both the Descriptive Event to provide context for the related item, and the Related Item itself, to build that durable relationship between the two resources.

Related Item, in conjunction with a Descriptive Event, is primarily used to indicate meaningful relationships such as

- Host-component part (for example, a Video Mosaic collection clip, related back to the raw footage from which it is derived)

- Is referenced by (for example, to relate the videos referenced in a dissertation to that dissertation)

- Is version of (for example, an author's original of a journal article, related to the Version of Record published by the journal)

- Associated with (used for less formal relationships, or when no other term applies)

Every Related Item must be held by the repository, described in its own metadata record, and assigned a DOI.

THREE APPROACHES

There are basically three ways to relate resources:

1. Describe the related resource in a note and ingest it as its own data stream, with a descriptive label. In this case, there is no Descriptive Event and no Related Item. The related resource in this case is simply part of a compound object, bundled into the resource. Any data stream should be assigned its own label to clearly indicate the nature of that data stream. Examples: facsimiles (e.g., a transcript accompanying a video oral history) or ephemeral items not warranting a full description (e.g., a publicity brochure for a videorecorded event)

2. Describe the related resource as an Associated Object in a Descriptive Event, with no Related Item. This approach would typically be used where the related item requires context, but is not held in the repository (for example, the published version of a journal article for which faculty has deposited a manuscript version).

3. Describe the related resource as an Associated Object in a Descriptive Event, and describe it also as a Related Item; then manually create the RLS-EXT using DLR/Edit. This approach is typically used when the related item is held in the repository, is individually authored, and warrants a DOI, description, and discoverability in its own right (for example, a clip from a raw video). In this case, *also* catalog the related resource in its own right.

In general, with the exception of collections (which are related to individual resources via Related Item), one should think very carefully about creating a Related Item without a corresponding Descriptive Event. First, the Related Item doesn't provide much context, and second, it usually is not displayed. Related Item is really a mechanism to automatically generate relationships, and should be used that way.

Similarly, if a related item is documented in a Descriptive Event, there should generally be a corresponding Related Item, unless the related item is not held in the repository. When an item is not held in the repository (or is not appropriate for the repository), but a Descriptive Event would be useful to provide context, a clickable link is always helpful; for that a URI is required, so one option is to put the item up on the web. Alternatively, if the item has no URI and doesn't warrant a DOI, simply ingest it as another datastream within the same digital object.

Apply cataloger's judgment in determining which approach to use, in consultation with the creator. Document the decision in the application profile for the collection, along with the justification for the decision.

Consider the following factors to identify the best approach. When in doubt, create a Related Item.

The following factors argue in favor of Descriptive Event/Related Item (Approach #3):

- The related item is fairly meaningful and stands on its own

- The related item has separate attribution (authorship)

- The related item has scholarly value in its own right

- The related item warrants separate rights acknowledgments

- The related item warrants full cataloging to ensure discoverability

- The related item is durable and/or warrants preservation

- The related item is held in the repository

- The related item warrants a DOI

Factors arguing *against* adding a Descriptive Event/Related Item (Approach #1 or #2)

- The related item is not held by the repository[1]

- The related item is fairly ephemeral[2]

- The related item is related to the event (and thus described within the event as an associated object), but not so related to the resource itself[3]

- The related item is considered a facsimile, or alternate format of the resource itself useful to support various user abilities (for example the transcript of an oral history video)[4]

- The related item is not individually authored and attribution is not considered important

- The volume of related items is such that the expense of individually cataloging each one outweighs the benefits

- There is little to be said about the related item (i.e. any description would be minimal); it does not demand to have a description in its own right

- The related item does not need to be managed for preservation purposes

- The related item does not warrant a DOI, or is too ephemeral for a DOI

- A decision has been made to disallow independent discoverability of the related item (for example, with unattributed student works)

---

[1] MODS Related Item is intended to support relating items within the repository (particularly for those who create separate records for each format). Also, since we have decided to use Related Item as the mechanism to define relationships, and we hope eventually to create context maps based on those relationships, we have to be sparing and careful about linking to outside resources via Related Item. We might, in that case, find it difficult to create a context map that links resources in the repository.

[2] For example, in an instrumentation record, one might relate back to a manufacturer's sheet or a manufacturer's guide to an instrument; that's more of a surrogate or a stand-in for the instrument, not truly a related item. On the other hand, in an instrumentation record, there might be an event for instrument calibration, with a calibration record; that would be associated with the instrumentation and described as a Related item.

[3] For example, in a grant award event, the abstract of a grant is related to the event, but not really to the resource itself. Therefore it would be described as an associated object in the event, but not be described as a Related item, since it is not related to the resource itself.

[4] This practice should be revisited in future, as we explore the use of analytics which play the video alongside the transcript; in that case it might make sense to make the transcript its own resource.

R7.4 SPECIFICATIONS
ORCID ID implementation

Kalaivani Ananthan and Jane Otto

April 21, 2014

Currently (in R7.3) ORCID can be entered in "My Profile" but is not being recorded in metadata for future use. The Metadata Working Group and the Cyber Infrastructure Steering Committee propose that it should be saved permanently in the metadata.

WMS database changes:

- Add three new attributes in <mods:name>
    - authority;
    - authorityURI;
    - valueURI

WMS Form Changes:

- Labels:
    - authority = Term Source; place it above the "Family Name".
    - valueURI = ORCID; place it under "Term Source" and add a link next to the element: 'What is ORCID?'   Make the link go to http://orcid.org/
    - Don't display authorityURI on the form but write "http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/identifiers/orcid.html" in the FOXML. Question: Is it possible to display this as a clickable link but make it read-only?

Faculty Deposit Form Change:

- Add a new element under "Author (person)" between Last Name and Role. Label the element "ORCID"; add a link next to the element: 'What is ORCID?'   Make the link go to http://orcid.org/
- If ORCID is available in My Profile, populate this field automatically.
- If ORCID is not in My Profile, and if the faculty member enters in the ORCID field in the FD form, add it in the Faculty member's Profile (if possible).
- Map ORCID to <mods:name type="personal">

```
<mods:name type="personal" authority="orcid" authorityURI="
http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/identifiers/orcid.html" valueURI="http://orcid.org/xxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxx">

   <mods:namePart type="family">Kalaivani</mods:namePart>
   <mods:namePart type="given">Ananthan</mods:namePart>
   <mods:role>
        <mods:roleTerm type="text"
        authority="marcrelator">Author</mods:roleTerm>
   </mods:role>
</mods:name>
```

My Profile Change:

- Add a link next to ORCID element: 'What is ORCID?'   Make the link go to http://orcid.org/

Cataloging Policy change:

- Discuss the change at the MDWG meeting; authority should now be coded, and ORCID form of name takes precedence over LCNAF
- Metadata managers should be notified and documentation updated.

Note: Grace and MDWG propose to wait for a while before adding ORCID to the ETD submission form.

RETROSPECTIVE CHANGES TO FACULTY DEPOSIT METADATA

You will be working your way through faculty deposits in the WMS, identifying those that are journal articles, and making changes to the records as follows. See special instructions on the last page for those cases where the faculty deposit is not a journal article.

To begin, go to the 'Faculty/Departmental Collections' in RUcore: https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/faculty. Click the link 'Click here to Browse Faculty/Department Collections.' Go into each *individual's* (not departmental/corporate) collection to see the records within the individual's collection (Carleo Jenny Collection, Ribnicky, David Collection, Silver Lauren Collection, etc.). Pull up each record in WMS and process it according to the instructions below.

EDITING THE TITLE

1. Under **Title Information**, select the entry beginning 'uniform' (if there is one) and click Remove.

PUTTING THE VERSION TERM IN GENRE

2. Find the note which indicates the article's specific version. It will probably be the note beginning 'original version' or 'version identification.' It may begin with a statement such as "This is a **preprint** of an article submitted … " Translate that version term to a NISO JAV term (or 'Unidentified Version' if the version cannot be identified). See the attached list of NISO JAV version terms and definitions. If you can't be sure how it translates, ask Jane Otto and/or Rhonda Marker.

3. Under **Genre**, choose Term Source 'NISO JAV' and select the appropriate NISO JAV term (identified in step 2) from the Genre pulldown. Click 'Add more genre.'

MOVING NOTE INFORMATION INTO DESCRIPTIVE EVENT

4. Find the **Note** beginning 'citation/reference.' Select it, so it appears in the 'Value' box. Copy that citation, piece-by-piece, from the 'Value' box into the corresponding elements of a new descriptive event, as shown below.

5. Find the **Note** beginning 'source identifier.' Select it, so it appears in the 'Value' box. Copy the actual DOI (beginning with http) into the Reference element, under that same Associated Object in the Descriptive Event, as shown below. Do not copy the label 'DOI' from the Value box, nor the parenthetical version term.

```
Descriptive Event
          Type:              Citation
       Date & Time
          Encoding:          w3cdtf
          Date & Time        [type in the publication year in the form yyyy]
       Associated Object
          Type:              Journal
          Relationship:      has part
          Name               [type in the journal title]
          Identifier:        [type in volume and issue no. in the format 48(5)
          Identifier type:   volume and issue
          Reference          [copy in the published version's DOI in the form http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/xxx]
          Detail:            [type in the page range in the form 403-422]
```

DELETING NOTES THAT ARE NOW REDUNDANT

6. Select the **Note** beginning 'source identifier' and click Remove, since you've now input that DOI into a Descriptive Event.

7. Select the Note beginning 'citation/reference' and click Remove, since you've now input that information in a Descriptive Event.

EDITING ORIGIN INFO

8. If this is an article, review, conference paper, presentation, or lecture (see the original Genre term), it is considered unpublished and should not have a (publication) place or publisher. Most faculty deposits will fall into this category. If the resource is unpublished, deselect the Type value under Place, and remove the place name under Term. If in doubt as to whether something should be considered unpublished, ask Jane Otto and/or Rhonda Marker.

9. Confirm that this is not a Version of Record (see Step 2).

> If it is not, input the values from Date Issued into Date Created, then delete the values from Date Issued. Change the 'Date is:' value under Date Created to 'inferred.'

> If this *is* a Version of Record, leave the date in Date Issued and don't touch the Date Created element.

> In all cases, use Encoding w3cdtf.   For whichever date you use, set 'Sort by this date' to 'yes'

10. Delete the text for **Edition**, since you have recorded this as a NISO JAV term in the Genre element.

REMOVING RELATED ITEM

11. If there is a **Related Item with type 'has part**,' remove it.

Related Item
      Type: **has part**
      Title   **[type in the journal title]**

NISO JAV VERSION TERMS[5]

Author's Original

Any version of a journal article that is considered by the author to be of sufficient quality to be submitted for formal peer review by a second party. The author accepts full responsibility for the article. May have a version number or date stamp. Content and layout as set out by the author.

Submitted Manuscript Under Review

Any version of a journal article that is under formal review managed by a socially recognized publishing entity. The entity recognizes its responsibility to provide objective expert review and feedback to the author, and, ultimately, to pass judgment on the fitness of the article for publication with an "accept" or "reject" decision. May have a version number or date stamp. Content and layout follow publisher's submission requirements.

Accepted Manuscript

The version of a journal article that has been accepted for publication in a journal. A second party (the "publisher"—see "Version of Record" below for definition) takes permanent responsibility for the article. Content and layout follow publisher's submission requirements.

Version of Record

A fixed version of a journal article that has been made available by any organization that acts as a publisher by formally and exclusively declaring the article "published". This includes any "early release" article that is formally identified as being published even before the compilation of a volume issue and assignment of associated metadata, as long as it is citable via some permanent identifier(s). This does not include any "early release" article that has not yet been "fixed" by processes that are still to be applied, such as copy-editing, proof corrections, layout, and typesetting.

Corrected Version of Record

A version of the Version of Record of a journal article in which errors in the VoR have been corrected. The errors may be author errors, publisher errors, or other processing errors.

Enhanced Version of Record

A version of the Version of Record of a journal article that has been updated or enhanced by the provision of supplementary material.

Unidentified Version

Use this term when (after consultation with J. Otto and/or R. Marker, you can't tell which version it is.

NOTE: If the resource is not a journal article, record the record number from RUcore, title, and category of resource, as best you can identify it, e.g., video; PowerPoint presentation. The record number is in the URL that displays when you're in the full record, for example:

https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/26685/

jjo April 21, 2014