SW Arch Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2014

Agenda

- Announcements and Updates
    - o R7.3.2 status
    - o UMDNJ Department codes
- Specifications
    - o Threaded discussion for Analytics
    - o SOLR date ordering
    - o ORCID id
    - o Article cover sheets
    - o Article versions
- Technical Issues
    - o File upload – tar file, videos
    - o DIR file upload and techMD
    - o Review file naming in WMS

Announcements and Updates

We received an email, forwarded from Sam McDonald, requesting that we not block the Chinese Baidu search engine spider. Refreshments were available to celebrate our delivery of R7.3.

Threaded Discussion for Analytics

Chad reviewed the specification for this feature which will provide analytic users the ability to comment and build discourse pertaining to an entire analytic or to individual analytic components. Access to the analytic by non-creators is established and controlled by the analytic creator. There were no recommended changes so the specification can be considered final.

SOLR Date Querying and Ordering

Jeffery reviewed the specification for creating SOLR date sorting fields based on different MODS date elements. This capability normalized the MODS date elements, creating an integer field that can be used for ordering dates. The specification will be updated to recognize a recently added attribute "keydate", indicating that the associated date field should be used for ordering. In the discussion, it was noted that early in RUcore development, dates were not standardized. We will examine these manually and make the appropriate corrections. For EZID acceptance of dates, we will need to adhere to the ISO 8601 standard. We will also need a process for displaying negative dates. Currently, the Roman Coins project enters a date text string in dateOther (e.g. 213 B.C.E.) to address this issue.

ORCID id Support

Kalaivani reviewed the specification for entering the OCRID id in MODS, noting that this ID can be entered in the user account profile. The specification also covered the faculty deposit user interface changes and automatic population of the ORCID id if it exists in the user profile. One change was suggested for the specification. The feature to populate the ID in the user profile from the FD form will be provided in R7.5

Cover Sheet

Ron reviewed the implementation specification for the generation of the cover sheet, based on the functional specification by J. Otto. The following changes were recommended for implementation of the cover sheet feature:

1. Remove "unidentified version" as an option for selection in the FD user interface. This step will encourage depositors to do their best to select one of the standard versions.
2. Following APA guidelines, use initials for the first name rather than the full name.
3. The explicit format for multiple authors has been noted.
4. For "Author's Original" citation, use the "publication date of the journal" from the FD form rather than the ingest date.
5. For a published article citation, populate the "Date of Creation" in the descriptive event with the "publication date of the journal". This date is found in MODS dateCreated.
6. Only deposits with genre "Article, Refereed" or "Article, Non-Refereed" will receive cover sheets in R7.4. Further investigation can be undertaken regarding other deposits such as lectures, presentations, etc.
7. It is recommended that "Terms of Use" and the description of RUcore on the cover sheet be single spaced in order to keep the cover sheet to a single page. We also should consider making the RUcore logo much smaller – again to save space. There also is a pending decision on inserting an RU logo on the cover sheet.

Article Versions

Ron reviewed the specification for handling versions of articles in R7.4, based on the functional specification by J. Otto. The software architecture team recommended that the article architecture place each version in separate object. This approach has the benefit of maintaining DOI integrity, simplifying the dialog with the depositor, requiring only one set of metadata in an object, and significantly simplifying the FD architecture. Additionally, we recommended that the user interface for requesting the user to select a term for the version be modified to include, parenthetically, common language that will be easily recognized. For example, "Version of Record" might appear as "Version of Record (Publisher Version)".

There was much discussion about how a user can identify a previous version that has been ingested into RUcore. For R7.4, we decided that the user can use RUcore to search for their articles and provide a URL. This URL could be either a DOI, an HDL, or the user could provide the RUcore URL

that has the rutgers-lib ID. Given that any user will have relatively few articles over the next year or so, we decided that we would not present them with a list of their articles (this can be considered in a subsequent release). The URL should be inserted in the relatedItem record of the object. Since titles are likely to change, it is not necessary to provide the title.

In R7.4, we will use a manual process to create the descriptive event and rels-ext that will point to earlier versions of the articles. It was felt that this approach will provide valuable experience to help us implement the more automatic approach in R7.5. As a result, we concluded that WMS will not need to retain article history for R7.4.

We amended the approach for removing earlier versions from search results. It was observed that the portal key can be removed in the SOLR indexing process so that earlier versions will not be discoverable in a portal. However, all versions will be indexed and therefore can be viewed in dlr/EDIT. The decision on when to remove the portal key can be made based on the appearance in the object of the rels-ext relationship isVersionOf.

There was much discussion regarding access to previous articles. One perspective is that all articles have been published and have a DOI. Therefore the library does not have the authority to restrict access to earlier articles. The other perspective is that users will want to know if they is a later version available. There are two possible approaches: 1) the DOI will take the user to a landing page that will have a descriptive events pointing to all earlier versions or 2) we can insert an intervening landing page that sends the user to the most recent version and requiring them to contact RUcore if they want a previous version. More discussion is required on this issue.

Other Items

Dave will proceed with installing dot release R7.3.2 which provides for Google indexing of RUcore URLs.

Agenda Items for the Next Meeting (May 8, 2014)

- More discussion of version and cover sheet specification
- Additional specifications
- Technical issues not covered in this meeting
- Reminders

rcj – 05/07/2014