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
  
  o Develop criteria and simple process for screening new collections (who: Committee; when: summer 2008)

- Metadata Committee will
  
  o 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)
  
  o Create draft guidelines for records contributed to portal (who: Marta Deyrup; when: Dec. 24, 2007)

- Team Catholic Portal (Notre Dame) will
  
  o 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)
  
  o Create an advanced search interface for portal (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
  
  o 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)
  
  o Make changes to search results displays (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)
    
    i. Change “Publisher” to “Repository”
    
    ii. Add name of collection to brief, i.e. folder level display
  
  o With Collection and Metadata Committees, incorporate records from Phase 1 into Phase 2 interface (who: CC MC TCP; when: summer 2008)
  
  o Make Phase 2 interface the default interface (who: TCP; when: summer 2008)