

American West Conference Call  
June 14, 2005 11am-12pm  
Minutes

Attendees: Attending: Willet (PW), Johnston (LJ), Llona (EL), Lally (AL), Madsen (CM), Loy (DL), J.Lee (JL), Poe (FP), Chandler (RC), H.Lee (HL), Madsen (CM)

## 1. Welcome and agenda - HL

## 2. METS process (20 mins) - DL

[http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/amwest/dlf200504\\_oaiArch\\_handout.pdf](http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/amwest/dlf200504_oaiArch_handout.pdf) and METS doc attached in June 13 email.

Overview: Ingest process and METS records generation -

- Harvest is identified for processing
- All files associated with the harvest are located. Each file consists of an extracted Dublin Core record from the OAI ListRecords response.
- Metadata is extracted from OAI data
- Identify METS profile to be used
- External Components are identified from Metadata – DC Identifier
- New ark identifier is created.
- From the metadata, the external component, the ark and the profile – a SIP mets record is generated for ingest handling in the framework
- ID all records passed on ingest and convert OAI into METS records that contain two parts -- One part is the metadata records, the other is the identifier that's being referenced in the metadata which often is an URL pointing to a webpage that contains descriptive info and a link to the digital object.

Discussion:

EL – CDL chooses to create METS records because that's the format CDL uses?

DL – Yes that's the main reason. METS is our standard for ingesting records into CDL repository.

EL – Do you attempt to include administrative metadata, like rights info which is important to have?

DL – Yes we would be looking into that. We'll use ARK, permanent consistent id for objects that would allow us to compare the records with an earlier harvest.

FP – Would we be able to provide statistics on how often a harvested collection get accessed?

DL – Yes we would be able to provide usage stats at a larger level (by institutions or collections) based on the unique identifier in the METS record, but we will not be able to record usage of content files stored at originating institution.

EL – Do you save the original harvest records?

DL – Yes, both the original and the enhanced records for ingest are saved.

LJ – Have you thought about keeping different versions when re-harvesting or overwriting the harvest?

DL – We are discussing this issue and have not made a decision on this yet.

### 3. Librarians in the Wild – JL

[http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/amwest/libCuratorialTool\\_report.pdf](http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/amwest/libCuratorialTool_report.pdf)

Overview: Curation is important in the AmWest project and as I view it there are two types of curation. First, there is “big” curation, which deals with creating large scale collections that will rely on the development of tools and large collections. Second type is “little” curation which is smaller in scale and will include customization tools that enable users to build their own browsable views or subsets of the American West collection.

This assessment we focused on little curation and asked our interviewees the following key questions:

1. Mission – the extent to which libraries value online exhibit building and how they view this activity within the context of their organization as a whole.
2. Organizational/Institutional Barriers – the organizational and institutional barriers to building online exhibits.
3. Support/Infrastructure – the status of online exhibit building support and infrastructure in academic libraries.
4. Tools and Systems – the tools and systems that libraries have employed for exhibit building

We’ve identified three levels of online exhibits –

Level 1 • Online exhibit is a virtual (online) re-creation of a physical exhibit.

- May include images of items in the physical exhibit and any copy written for the exhibit

Level 2 • All elements of level one *plus* additional context and content

Level 3 • Composed of digital surrogates

- Physical counterpart may never be realized
- Primary experience meant to occur online

Some obstacles in creating online exhibits –

- lack of financial and human resources.
- how an organization views its mission is an important factor in determining how open it may be to adopting new technology or collaborating with others.
- FP – What are the skills that are missing at those libraries that prevent them from pursuing online exhibits? Was it web skill, info architecture skill?
- JL – All of the above. Librarians need help across the board. Librarians want tools that are stable, standard, and supported. We brought up the issue of using templates and the responses are mixed. Some like the idea of using templates especially when they don’t have design staff. Some are not sure about the idea thinking that may mean giving up control of how the collection would look like. And if libraries have in-house designer, or have outsourced the design, they may not be that interested in using templates.
- FP – We’ve shown them the SFMOMA Pachyderm package, a suite of tools that consists of various components for building online exhibits. Libraries that don’t have the design staff have no resistance to using templates that’d allow them to quickly assemble an online collection or exhibit.

“Exhibit” or “Collection” -

CM – In talking with the interviewees, have you discovered their approach in building online exhibits versus a collection?

JL – We chose the term “exhibit” as we see it as something that’s more of a narrative view of a collection. The roles of libraries and museums are converging.

FP- this issue often came up and it seemed to us that it is less problematic than we expected. Librarians have adopted their own vocabularies and used what’s work for them.

Going forward –

RC – we're absorbing FP and JL's assessment work and considering next steps. For the immediate future we'll be focusing on assessment and usability activities for the user interface and tools created for librarians.

LJ – Are you planning any similar work with other audience? At our location primary audience is scholar/faculty members. They also built online collection that's very similar to the online exhibits you're talking about.

RC – we are still looking at various possibilities and unsure of the direction we'll go. We do realize there are different needs for that audience.

#### **4. High-level topic assessment survey – FP**

Background: Geneva Gano's report gave a content review and a structure of 27 categories organizing AmWest content. Landis began working on them as the high-level browse topics and subsequently reduced them to 23 categories.

The question is to test the names of those categories, test the distinctiveness of each topic, and whether each is sufficient in representing the subjects that lie underneath it.

We'll be analyzing the raw data that we gathered from the survey and will take down the passworded website until we complete the report.

The assessment has informed us that the 23 topics were far too many and we have collapsed them into 15 topics since then.

RC – in the larger context we are also developing browse topics for the CDL public site, Calisphere, which has a primary audience of teachers.

FP – Yes and teachers are interested in having those topics that fit into existing standards. There are two approaches in presenting the topics in browse – one that utilizes general topic headings similar to LCSH, and one that's from grouping the content in the collection and coming up with browse terms that best describe that content.