Minutes
Metadata Working Group (7/21/2014)


Announcements: No new announcements

**DOIs and Collection Objects (KA)**

DOIs were implemented at the beginning of the year for all new objects, including collection objects. DOIs require dates to be entered in a specific format, typically supplied in our case, from the `<mods:dateIssued>` or `<mods:dateCreated>` fields in the metadata record. This poses a problem in the case of collection objects, as most users haven’t been entering dates when creating new collection objects. The result is that the status of DOI for a collection object is commonly set to “reserved,” making them not publicly usable as a persistent ID for the collection object, and presenting users with an error message when such a link is accessed.

Next steps are to tell Software Architecture what changes we want to make, and to record this decision in our guidelines.

Concerns:

- DOIs are the persistent URLs for each resource in RUcore, and replace handles (created prior to 2014). Not having fully publicly available DOIs could present an issue for users seeking citable, persistent URLs for collection objects.
  
  o On the other hand, it appears that searching for and retrieving collection objects is an exception, with limited scope of use. It may be confusing for general users if collection objects are available, particularly those with DOIs. Collection objects are currently available for searching in the RUcore advanced search interface (under Type of Resource).

- Entering an incorrect date (e.g. 9999) could be problematic, as EZID displays and propagates this as the date the item was created. Aggregators such as Thomson Reuters will then, in turn, display this incorrect date prominently.

One proposed option is to simply use the date the collection object was created, and consistently enter this into collection metadata records in the WMS. Although this would have little meaning to anyone beyond the metadata creator, it would still meet the criteria required to generate publicly available DOIs.

Other concerns requiring broader discussion: Should we make collection objects non-public, non-displaying items? This may be a greater public services issue that requires
discussion and decision by appropriate working groups. Alternately, some collection records may be selectively set not to display (e.g. faculty collection records), depending on the issues that may be caused with confusing date metadata.

Consensus from the group: DOIs should continue to be created for collection objects. If we have a valid date for a collection (i.e. a static, defined date for objects in the collection), this will be used to satisfy EZID date requirements for creating DOIs. The start date will be used when there is a range of dates. If such a date is unavailable, the date that the collection object was created will be used.

**R7.4 testing/procedures to catalog secondary objects (KA)**

R7.4 testing continues; one more session is scheduled for Thursday morning. The hope is that this will be the last round of testing on the development server, with all pressing and show-stopper bugs fixed. As of this morning, there were 22 active bugs for the WMS. Of these, 4 bugs were identified as critical, 11 bugs were classified as normal priority, and 7 were classified as minor. Additionally, 14 bugs are in “test” status, meaning that a fix is in place and users need to test it to ensure the problem is, in fact, corrected. At this time, a request is being made to halt the addition of new, non-critical bugs into the software.libraries bug tracking system. If new, non-critical bugs are found, this will be recorded and entered later by K. Ananthan.

K. Ananthan reminded the group that it’s important they learn how to catalog secondary objects (e.g. versioning, administrative/supplementary documents) in the WMS, and understand the process. Practice for this could be undertaken during R7.4 testing.

A workshop for secondary object training was suggested.

Currently, a dlr/EDIT account is necessary to perform some RELS-EXT related actions in enabling secondary object cataloging. A suggestion was made to setup a module in the WMS to provide a simpler interface to configure this that wouldn’t expose users to the full dlr/EDIT interface. This is in progress but K. Ananthan isn’t sure in which release it will be available. The scope of access could also be limited by user, which could permit linking this module to single-sign-on (SSO).

**Review application profiles (Journal articles and Faculty deposits) - (RM/JJO)**

The SOAR (Scholarly Open Access at Rutgers) and journal article application profiles were reviewed. Excel spreadsheets for these APs are in Sakai in a folder titled “Application profiles”.

SOAR: An additional column in Descriptive MD was added (Inherited/Keyed/System Supplied/Do Not Use) to accommodate this information. J. Otto would like to specify secondary object policies and how to handle administrative documents in the AP. Search
and browse by department features need to be addressed, as this is currently a manual process. Cover sheet procedures also need to be addressed. These will be added to the AP document.

Journal articles: A tab with general instructions documents current procedures for cataloging these objects, as such procedures may change, and clear documentation on what was done today will be helpful in the future. Additionally, in Descriptive MD, a note to catalogers to enter the author’s ORCID if known.

Both APs are still drafts in-process and more information will be added to each.

Additional Items:

- Beginning with R7.4, there will no longer be a manuscript content model. Will templates created with the existing Manuscript content model migrate to the Document CM that supersedes it in R7.4?
  - Further testing needed to determine this. It’s possible such templates may need to be re-created using the new content model.

Next scheduled meeting:
August 18, 2014 @ 1:30PM to 3:30PM
Location: TSB Conference Room