

CRRA: Moving toward broader implementation
Joint Sessions Metadata/Collections Committees
Thurs, Nov. 1-Fri., Nov. 2, 2007
Minutes

In attendance, Collection Committee: Matt Blessing, Lynn Conway (by phone), Alan Delozier, Alan Krieger, Diane Maher, Robert O'Neill, chair (Thurs. AM)

In attendance, Metadata Committee: Ruth Bogan (moderator and recorder), Marta Deyrup, Susan Leister, Eric Lease Morgan

Guest attendees: Amy Braitsch (Thurs.), Kevin Cawley, David Horn

Agenda Item 1: Discuss relationships among various metadata standards, how applied, etc. including EAD, Dublin Core, DACS (Describing Archives: A Content Standard)

Highlights from discussions:

- To attract broad participation, particularly from non-archival communities, the CRRA must accept metadata in formats other than EAD.
- MARC and Dublin Core should be supported, but search results must be coherent for searches across multiple formats.

Agenda Item 2: Review current statements on metadata standards and communication protocols, e.g. OAI, in the CRRA Prospectus and previous Metadata Committee minutes

Highlights from discussions:

- The CRRA should develop a core record standard, outlining the required minimum data for metadata records; look to AACR2 and DACS for guidance
- The CRRA should develop a guidelines document
 - Include core standards for item and collection descriptions
 - Keep it simple
 - Link to existing guidelines
 - Include what to put in certain fields
 - Written for non-librarians
 - Can change later
 - Suggest multiple levels of description
- The CRRA will not impose a restriction against records that have been or will be contributed to other union catalogs or portals, e.g. to OCLC's WorldCat.
- Non compliant metadata should be reported back to participants for editing
- Discussions about requirements for level of control of name and subject terms were inconclusive; consensus about need for some level of control

Agenda Item 3: Identify what has been learned from the pilot projects (Action item 8)

Highlights from discussions

- The CRRA must have metadata standards and guidelines
- Not yet ready to invite new participants
- Scope and functionality of portal are clearer to participants, but not completely clear

- Currently not a repository
- Emphasis is on linking users to collection owner's web site via URLs in metadata records
- Institution decides whether to contribute collection description or item description and at what level of complexity, as long as core record standard is honored.
- A CRRA project manager would help the project move more smoothly

Agenda Item 4: Discuss best practices for getting new content on the portal. Refer to Action item 9: Refine and implement the process for bringing resources under intellectual control and display on the portal

See Agenda Item 7

Agenda Item 5: Review proposed job description for CRRA project manager

Highlights from discussions

- Position has three critical areas of responsibility
 - coordination and troubleshooting
 - communication
 - training
- Project manager will be “the person to call” for initial consultation, advice, problems. May direct questions to committees or individuals as appropriate.
- Project manager will need people skills.
- Project manager might benefit from subject knowledge of Catholic tradition, previous experience with similar projects

Agenda Item 6: Discuss browse functionality and other enhancements for the portal

See Agenda Item 7

Agenda Item 7: Identify actions for the Metadata and/or Collection Committee, their relative importance, how they can be achieved, etc.

Action items

- Collections Committee will
 - Identify additional themes for collections. The following were suggested, pending approval by Chair (who: Chair; when: asap):
 - Catholic higher education
 - Catholic missions
 - Diocesan archives/Papers of bishops
 - Men religious orders
 - Second Vatican Council
 - Women religious orders
 - Contribute more records (finding aids) related to original themes plus additional themes (who: Committee; when: as finding aids are available)
 - Review contributions (finding aids) from first iteration of portal for inclusion in latest version of portal to determine (who: Committee; when: summer 2008)
 - If record should be included in Second Phase

- If record should have additional themes per expanded list
 - Develop criteria and simple process for screening new collections (who: Committee; when: summer 2008)
- Metadata Committee will
 - Write a charge for Marta, describing a set of guidelines, including criteria for core records for individual items and for collections (who: Chair with Committee; when: asap)
 - Create draft guidelines for records contributed to portal (who: Marta Deyrup; when: Dec. 24, 2007)
- Team Catholic Portal (Notre Dame) will
 - Create two data entry forms for web based entry of metadata describing 1) a single item, and 2) a collection (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
 - Create an advanced search interface for portal (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
 - Move SRU and administrative interface choices from CRRA home page to appropriate page; move working documents and minutes to behind-the-scenes (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
 - Make changes to search results displays (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
 - Change “Publisher” to “Repository”
 - Add name of collection to brief, i.e. folder level display
 - With Collection and Metadata Committees, incorporate records from Phase 1 into Phase 2 interface (who: CC MC TCP; when: summer 2008)
 - Make Phase 2 interface the default interface (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)