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Selections from wide-ranging work agenda

- Projects of broad interest
- Necessarily partial!
- Website contains comprehensive information

www.oclc.org/research/activities/
Scope of work

RLG Partnership Activities...
- Explore and frame
- Allow for experimentation
- Urge toward evolution
- Provide a path forward

Participation and benefits
- Papers and reports
- Webinars
- Working Groups
- Events
Webinar outline

Collective Collection
- Green ILL Practices & Deaccessioning Decision Tree with Dennis Massie
- Cloud Library with Constance Malpas
- In-copyright Print Books with Brian Lavoie

Mobilizing Unique Materials
- Evaluating Rights & Risk for Unpublished Materials with Ricky Erway
- Special Collections Survey with Jackie Dooley

Research Information Management
- The Library’s Role in Research Assessment with John MacColl
- Data Curation with Stu Weibel

Metadata Support & Management
- Social Metadata with Karen Smith-Yoshimura

Plus a preview of coming events, reports, webinars, etc.
Green ILL Practices
Deaccessioning Decision Tree
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Green ILL Practices

- California Environmental Associates
- 3-month study
- 2 site visits, dozen telephone interviews
- Focus on processes, plant, packaging, shipping
- Goal: reduce carbon footprint of entire resource sharing system
- Emphasis on affordability
- Inspired by Karen Bucky, Clark Art Institute, SEG
Findings and Recommendations

- Packaging material production 51% of GHG emissions/package
- Shipping operations 48% of GHG emissions/package
- Waste disposal 1% of GHG emissions/package
- Can cut emissions nearly in half by re-using packaging materials
Findings and Recommendations

- Re-use > New
- Mailers > Boxes
- Ground > Air
- Near > Far
- Local courier > FedEx/UPS
- Aggregate > 1X1
- Nylon bags > plastic bins
- 30% recycled = new ($-wise)
Sharing the green

- Presenting at ALA MW
- Webinar in winter/spring
- Formal report before summer

- Greening ILL Toolkit
  - Greening check list
  - Best practices
  - Resources

- Keeping the conversation going
Deaccessioning Decision Tree

Deaccessioning Print Journals Group
- Concentrated on dual format
- Documented obstacles
- Prioritized data elements
- Noted missing pieces

Assignment from RLG Programs Council
- Create deaccessioning decision tree

Beginning Questions:
- Organizing Principle?
- Level of granularity?
- How long before it’s too late?
Deaccessioning Decision Tree

- Organizing principles
  - Mission of library
  - Risk tolerance

- Types of Research Libraries owning print journals
  - Assume preserving print not part of mission; decisions based on local need
  - Due to risk aversion, policy, politics or personalities, no print will be discarded, aside from weeding out-of-scope items
  - Willing to discard duplicates and selected print journal back files available in e-format
  - Open to discarding titles beyond duplicates; seek to do so sensibly and collaboratively
  - See preserving scholarly record as essential to mission; committed to keeping what print they have
Deaccessioning Decision Tree

- Ithaka paper “What to Withdraw”
  - 4 exemplary scenarios
  - Repeatedly decries lack of centralized information

- Back to first principles
  - Key obstacle: already in storage
  - Storage as a de facto archive?
  - Knowing what is stored currently impossible
  - Is there a moderate-effort way to approximate a snapshot of what’s held in storage across the entire network?
  - Why not assign items in storage a different WC symbol?
  - With that as a first step, what could be done on top of that?
Constance Malpas
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‘Toward a Cloud Library’

Objective: Characterize the near-term opportunity for externalizing management of academic research collections, leveraging capacity of large-scale shared print and digital repositories

Outcomes: opportunity and risk assessment based on aggregate collection analysis; draft service agreement enabling generic consumer library to selectively outsource preservation and access of low-use research collections to large-scale print and digital repositories

Who’s involved: NYU, Hathi Trust, ReCAP libraries
  from OCLC Research: Constance, Roy, Shailen
  with support from: CLIR, Mellon Foundation

Timeline: July - December 2009
  draft report anticipated Jan/Feb ‘10
Shared Infrastructure: Books & Bits

Academic off-site storage

HathiTrust

25 years +70M vols.

15 months +5M vols.

Will this intersection create new operational efficiencies?
For which libraries?
Under what conditions?
How soon and with what impact?
Methodology

Data processing and analysis (Roy, Constance)
Harvest Hathi metadata
... Enhance
  ... Map to WorldCat bibliographic records
  ... Merge WorldCat, Hathi, ReCAP (sample) data
  ... Analyze .... rinse, repeat = 17M records

Interpretation (OCLC Research, NYU, Hathi, ReCAP)
Facilitated dialogue: service expectations - Sept
Collaborative authoring: service agreement - Dec
What’s in the Cloud?

Based on analysis of titles in Hathi archive:

- 2.8 million digitized *books* (97%); 97K serials (3%)
- *Humanities* constitute >50% of collection
- ~350K titles (12%) in the *public domain*

* * * *

- 2 million titles archived in Hathi (70%) are *also* held in print form by at least one large-scale *shared print* repository
- 1.4 million archived titles (48%) are held by *fewer than 25 libraries*
Implications for Collection Management

- If a *guarantee of digital preservation alone* were sufficient to justify de-duplication of print books, academic libraries in North America could achieve a **20-40% reduction** in local inventory in the near term.

- If a *supplemental guarantee of preservation in a shared print repository* is required (secure digital copy + secure print copy), a **5-15% reduction** is possible.

- Levels of duplication in ‘*unsecured*’ inventory may influence adoption of either strategy.
Impact on Library Operations

- Selective reduction in low-use print inventory enables *reallocation of library resources* toward more distinctive service profile
- Storage transfer and weeding decisions informed by *system-wide view* of preservation infrastructure
- Significant *long-term cost avoidance*: print book inventory drives 95% of ARL lifecycle expenditures
- Shared service agreements *limit institutional exposure to risk*
One-time cost avoidance ~$800K
*Annual cost avoidance ~$200K
*Lifecycle cost avoidance ~$15M
In-copyright Print Books in Library Collections
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Beyond 1923
Characteristics of Potentially In-copyright Print Books in Library Collections

Brian Lavoie
Lorcan Dempsey
OCLC Online Computer Library Center
{lavoie, dempsey}@oclc.org

Introduction

Issues of copyright and permissible use have swirled around efforts to digitize print book collections. Sharp debate has ensued over the circumstances in which creating a digital surrogate and making it accessible online runs afoul of copyright protections, and what remedies might be appropriate to compensate rights holders. Some digitization efforts, such as the Open Content Alliance, have restricted themselves to public domain materials; Google Books, on the other hand, has sought to reach agreement with copyright holders represented by the Authors Guild and the Association of American Publishers. A proposed class-action settlement, announced in October 2008, would create a Book Rights Registry responsible for administering and adjudicating the process of locating and compensating rights holders impacted by Google's digitization activities.

The Google book settlement provoked spirited discussion of its potential ramifications, mimicking the commotion that followed the announcement of the original Google Print for Libraries (later re-named Google Books) project in December 2004. Using data from the WorldCat bibliographic database, OCLC Research published an article in 2005 aimed at illuminating issues surrounding Google's plan to digitize the print book collections of five major research libraries. The present article is motivated by a similar purpose: to provide empirical context for the many discussions surrounding the digitization of in-copyright print books. The settlement has raised challenging questions regarding permissible use of print book titles published after 1923; many of these titles may eventually form a significant part of the Google book database should it come to pass.
Difficult copyright issues surround print book digitization

- Google class-action settlement
- Discussion about digitization, copyright, and application to library print book collections

WorldCat:

- Best source of aggregated data about print books in library collections
- Many private inquiries received

“Beyond 1923”:

- General characteristics of in-copyright print books in library collections
- Empirical context for ongoing discussion
Basic data: WorldCat (April 2009)

- Records: 135.3m
- Books: 104.1m
- Print Books: 84.8m
- US-published Print Books: 15.5m

FRBR Manifestations
US-published print books

- Pre-1923: 14 percent
- 1923-1963: 17 percent
- Post-1963: 65 percent
- Unknown: 4 percent
- Unknown: 4 percent

Unknown: 4 percent
Whose collections?

US-published print books in WorldCat (15.5m manifestations):
  ... 11 percent of the materials in WorldCat Account for ~657,000,000 holdings:
  ... 46 percent of all WorldCat holdings

- Academics: 56 percent
- Publics: 33 percent
- Other: 11 percent
More analysis/findings ...

- Analysis of “potentially in-copyright” US-published print books:
  - Most frequently-encountered authors
  - Breakdown by subject
  - Audience level
  - Comparison to collective holdings of three large academic research library participants in Google Books

- Other findings/observations:
  - More than 80 percent of US-published print books in WorldCat are “potentially in-copyright” (post-1923); considerable effort and expense to investigate copyright status and clear copyright
  - Difficulty assessing copyright status using automated processes
  - Information needed for copyright assessment often in sources beyond the bibliographic record
Evaluating Rights and Risk for Unpublished Materials
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Rights management and collections of unpublished materials

- Planned event - date yet to be announced
- Accessible to those with travel restrictions
- Topics
  - Laws related to rights in unpublished materials
  - The difficulty in and impact of following the rules
  - The nature and extent of the problem and why change is necessary
  - Taking chances - and what’s at stake
  - Balancing risk and benefit to society
A diverse survey population

275 institutions (some in multiple consortia)

- **ARL** (124 U.S. and Canadian research libraries)
- **CARL** (30 Canadian academic/research libraries)
- **IRLA** (20 independent research libraries)
- **Oberlin** (80 liberal arts colleges)
- **RLG** Partnership (85 university libraries, independent research libraries, museums, historical societies, *et al.* in U.S. and Canada)

151 responses (55%) ... and counting.
Are special collections accessible?

Backlogs
- 60% have decreased for printed volumes
- 44% have decreased for other formats

Online catalog records
- 84% of printed volumes (ARL ‘98: 73%)
- 57% of archives/manuscripts (ARL ‘98: 46%)

Archival management
- 45% of finding aids online (ARL ‘98: 16%)
- 65% use EAD
- 55% do some minimal processing (MPLP)
Are they being used?

Use has increased across the board
- 90% for archives/manuscripts
- 75% for visual materials
- 50% for other formats

Public services policies enable use
- Digital camera use is permitted (86%)
- Uncataloged materials can be used (92% for archives)
- Institutional blogs are popular (46%)
- Flickr, Facebook, Wikipedia links heighten visibility
- Some offer research fellowships (32%)
Digitization

- 77% have done some digitization
- 48% have an active program
- 36% have done large-scale digitization
- Special collections involved in project management, selection, metadata, imaging, web design, fundraising

Born-digital

- ca. 50% have begun collecting
- Photographs, audio, video are most widely held
- Lack of funding, time for planning, and expertise are most common impediments
Digitization

- 77% have done some digitization
- 48% have an active program
- 36% have done large-scale digitization
- Special collections involved in project management, selection, metadata, imaging, web design, fundraising

Born-digital

- ca. 50% have begun collecting
- Photographs, audio, video are most widely held
- Lack of funding, time for planning, and expertise are most common impediments
Most pressing needs for education/training

- Born-digital materials (82%)
- Information technology (62%)
- Intellectual property (59%)
- Cataloging and metadata (56%)

Number of staff

- Stable in most functional areas
- Increasing in digital/technology (42% of 125)
- Separate units continue to amalgamate

Demographic diversity (122 responses)

- 24% include Asian
- 26% include Black or African American
- 25% include Hispanic or Latino
Respondents’ concerns

“Your three most challenging issues”
- Born-digital materials
- Space
- Backlogs

Preservation
- Audiovisual materials are highest concern

Library-wide funding has decreased
- By 1-10% (50%)
- By 11-20% (15%)
- By more than 20% (8%)
Library roles in research assessment

A Comparative Review of Research Assessment Regimes in Five Countries and the Role of Libraries in the Research Assessment Process

A Pilot Study Commissioned by OCLC Research

Prepared by Key Perspectives Ltd
Truro, UK

And a Companion Report with key findings and recommendations due shortly...
Libraries in research assessment: a study of five countries (NL, IE, DK, AU)

The study aimed to ...

- Investigate the characteristics of research assessment regimes in five different countries and gather key stakeholders’ views about the advantages and disadvantages of research assessment
- Discover stakeholders’ perceptions of the effectiveness of research assessment including its advantages and disadvantages
- Analyse the effect of research assessment procedures on the values of the academy
- Reveal the characteristics of research library involvement in research assessment support
- Discover the extent to which research assessment forms part of institutions’ strategic planning processes and the role libraries play in planning for the future
- Draw out points of good or best practice for libraries in support of national or institutional research assessment
RIM overlapping environments

- **Research Funders**
  - Mission
  - Record of publications
  - Open Access mandate

- **Institution**
  - Mission
  - Record of publications
  - Open Access mandate

- **Domain**
  - Academic freedom
  - Output

- **Researcher**
  - Output

- **Assessment**
  - National economic performance
  - National research profile

- **Output**
“In Europe, on paper there are 2,000 universities focusing in theory on research and competing for people and funding. By comparison, in the US there are only 215 universities offering postgraduate programs, and less than a hundred among them are officially considered ‘research intensive universities’”

Sironi, Andrea ‘European universities should try to conquer the world’, Virtual Bocconi Articoli
Some key findings

- Libraries with repositories have had most involvement in their institutions’ assessment submissions.
- Australia furthest ahead there: largely because of government funding for repositories.
- The freedom to research what you want is fast disappearing everywhere - and in countries like the UK and Australia, it has been reducing for years. However, governments don’t want to lose it altogether. What is the right balance?
- In most countries, in most institutions, the library senior management role is operational rather than strategic (UK, Australia, Denmark).
- In the Netherlands, libraries are closely involved at the strategic level - but not in relation to research assessment.
Recommendations for research libraries

- Libraries should be sources of knowledge on disciplinary norms and practices in research outputs for their institutions
- Libraries should seek to sustain environments in which disciplines can develop while co-existing with political constraints
- Libraries should manage research outputs data at national and international scales
- Libraries should take responsibility for the efficient operation of research output repositories across research environments
- Libraries should provide expertise in bibliometrics
- Libraries should provide usage evidence
- Libraries should claim their territory
Data Curation

Stu Weibel
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Unfound data is unused data

Unused data will not attract resources or sustain attention

Unattended data is subject to bit-rot

*Reuse* and *Repurposing* are critical to preservation
Curation is...

- **Maintaining** and **adding value** to a trusted body of digital information for current and future use; specifically, the active management and appraisal of data over the life-cycle of scholarly and scientific materials. - *UK Digital Curation Centre*

- **Maintain value:** ensure persistent accessibility and usability of all ingested data collections

- **Add value:** enhance opportunity for future use and re-purposing
Basic preservation creates an “option to enrich”:
- Avoids expense without a clear demand
- Allocate scarce resources where most valued
- Dynamic appraisal of added value in relation to cost
- Metrics-driven
- Willingness and ability of community to fund
- Value-added services that enhance discovery, use, and re-purposing of data collections
Value Added Services: some examples

- **Structure**: promote ease of use, interoperability, and portability
- **Contextualize**: link to other data, protocols, devices, publications, people, organizations
- **Annotate**:
  - User-contributed expertise (crowd-sourcing)
  - Automated, machine-generated annotation and linking
  - Metadata librarians
Value Propositions for Libraries

- Crisis in digital preservation (see the Blue Ribbon Panel on Digital Preservation)
- Data curation is consistent with our professional values and traditions (managing the intellectual assets of the society)
- Fits naturally into the intellectual structures we maintain (monographs, scholarly papers....)
- Remain relevant in our communities of practice: If we don’t do it, who will?
- Strengthen the connection to the research process
Opportunities

- Data stewardship is a clean slate, start from scratch
- Reference data sets as services rather than formats (census, geo-referenced sociological, biomedical, engineering, climate, environmental)

Outreach to institutions, libraries, faculty, students:
- Improve curation practices
- Promote collaboration models
- Support practitioner skill sets
- Teach data design skills
- Increase awareness of curation as essential for the future of science
The NSF DataNet Solicitation

- Preserve national research investments in data
- Identify sustainability models
- Extract more value from data
  - More easily reused and repurposed
  - More discoverable
  - More accessible
- $100,000,000 (5 awards * 5 years * $4 mil)
Models and Metaphors

- New Organizations for data curation
- New opportunities for Grand Challenge Science
- Sustainable business model based on the Library
- SCOAP: Select, Collect, Organize, Access, Preserve
- Natural role for libraries and librarians
- The metaphor is the Machine Room
- Taking care of the bits
- New technology to promote discovery and reuse
- Managing and integrating data via automated means
Bottom Line

- Libraries have a natural role to play in data curation
- Curation skill sets require an amalgamation of Librarianship values and commitment as well as machine room technical skills.
- Investments in curricular change and training are necessary
- Failure to make this transition will threaten the role of libraries in the academy of the future
Sharing and Aggregating Social Metadata Project

Karen Smith-Yoshimura
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... helps us find data.
... helps us understand the data we find.
... helps us evaluate what we should spend our time evaluating.
NATIONAL INSTITUTION
- CULTURAL HUB
- ICONIC STATUS
- PRIMARY REPRESENTATIVE

CATALOG
Library Assets
- things
- services
- trust
- authority

SOCIAL SITES
- 2.0 TOOLS HERE
- CHOICE
- SCALE
- AGGREGATION

GIVE    SHARE

Passion

TAKE
RLG Partners Social Metadata Working Group

22 RLG Partner staff from five countries

Staffed by John MacColl and Karen Smith-Yoshimura

- Drew Bourn, Stanford
- Douglas Campbell, National Library of New Zealand
- Kevin Clair, Penn State
- Chris Cronin, U. Chicago
- Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, U. Minnesota
- Mary Elings, UC Berkeley
- Steve Galbraith, Folger
- Cheryl Gowing, U. Miami
- Rose Holley, National Library of Australia
- Rebekah Irwin, Yale
- Lesley Kadish, Minnesota Historical Society
- Helice Koffler, U. Washington
- Daniel Lovins, Yale
- John Lowery, British Library
- Mark Matienzo, NYPL
- Marja Musson, International Institute of Social History
- Henry Raine, New-York Historical Society
- Cyndi Shein, Getty
- Ken Varnum, U. Michigan
- Melanie Wacker, Columbia
- Kayla Willey, Brigham Young
- Beth Yakel, U. Michigan, School of Information
Focus:

- User contributions that can enrich the descriptive metadata created by libraries, archives, and museums.

- Issues that need to be resolved to communicate and share user contributions on the network level.
20 questions, 7 subgroups

- Assessment: Objectives? Success metrics?
- Content:
  - What user contributions would most enrich LAM resources?
  - What are exemplars of good social media sites?
- Policy:
  - To what extent is moderation necessary?
  - How do we encourage contributions?
  - How do we gauge authenticity?
- Technical and vocabularies: How do we enable users?
  Issues around vocabularies/sonksonomies?
## Social metadata site reviews

### 105 reviews of 68 sites, sites characterized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sites</th>
<th>Tags</th>
<th>Controlled Vocab</th>
<th>Comments/Annotations</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Lists</th>
<th>Images/Video</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Recommeder/Filtering</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Misc. / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled vocab: BIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives New Zealand Audio Visual Wiki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Brown Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CitelULike</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont College Digital Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades Digital Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flickr Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haags Gemeentearchief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET Knowledge Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibraryThing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Here: 200 Years of Immigration in England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and State Libraries Australasia [Australia/New Zealand]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit videos, allows online remixing of your videos or others online sharing your videos, provides an external tool for reflection on videos or remixing help
Examples of “social metadata”

Francis Joseph Glacier, 1906

Comments

Brenda Anderson says:
My photo from ninety years later (taken 1996), from about the same point. You can see how the glacier has receded over that time.

Photographer: James Ring; Photographic Archive, Alexander Turnbull Library, National Library of New Zealand
Ankle strap shoes for Prince Albert Victor made by Joseph Box, 1842 - 1892

User tags
- embroidery
- shoes

Related Subjects
- Exhibition of Antique and Historical Shoes, 1889
- Prince Albert Victor
- Royalty

This object belongs to
- Joseph Box Collection

Directly related objects
- H4448-1 Tie shoe, girls, leather/wood...
- H4448-10 Buckle shoe, mens, leather/si...
- H4448-100 Elastic sided boots, pair, wom...
- H4448-1001 Moccasins, pair, womens, bead...
- H4448-1002 Moccasin ankle boots, pair, m...
- H4448-1003 Moccasins, pair, mens, leathe...
- H4448-1004 Slip on shoes, pair, boys, si...
- H4448-1005 Slip on shoe for bound feet, ...
- H4448-1006 Shoe foundations for bound fe
Examples of “social metadata”

**Death Certificate Index**

**State File #: 1928-MN-013904**

**Name:** GODFREY, MICHAEL HOGAN

Number of comments: 1

**Daniel W Lynch** on 11, Nov 2008

Died of a heart attack on a Friday in Hibbing, MN. Age 56. Father: Robert Mother: Bridget Hogan. Mike was born on April 13, 1872 in Champion, Michigan. M. Cecelia Gandsey in 1897. Had 11 children, 8 lived. Worked for Oliver Iron Mining Co from 1893 until 1928. Was Western District Manager for Oliver from 1917 until his death. Was called a Prince of the Iron Range by Holbrook. Has an underground mine named after him outside of Hibbing. Was principal architect of move of north Hibbing forty to Central Addition from 1918 until 1922.

Date of Death: 13 JAN 1928

County of Death: ST. LOUIS

Is there a transcription error in the index? Submit a [correction](#).
The collections represented here have been chosen and curated by tribal consultants working in collaboration with University and Museum staff.
Item Notes

Firgurine/pendat fragment, head broken. Triangular body, horizontal rounded shoulders bit like a 40ties dress styne. Arms end in triangular points suggesting that they were folded in front of the chest or under the breasts. Incised 3 stand girdle. Public tr
Museum professionals found 88% of user tags “useful”.

If you found this work using this term would you be surprised?

86% of user tags not found in museum label copy.

Steve in Action: Social Tagging Tools and Methods Applied
Susan Chun, Tiffany Leason, Rob Stein, Bruce Wyman, and Beth Harris. A Workshop at the Museums and the Web Conference, Indianapolis, April, 2009
2009 Survey of social metadata site managers — 42 respondents

- US: 60%
- Australia/NZ: 24%
- UK: 10%
- Other: 7%
How long have you offered social media features on your site?

- 1-2 years (41%)
- Less than 1 year (21%)
- 3-4 years (10%)
- More than 4 years (19%)
- Not yet public (10%)
Some observations

- Great variety of sites - many new
- Success tied to objective and audience, not necessarily traffic
- Value in leveraging “sense of community”
- Some sites heavily moderated, others not at all
- Strict credentialing limits contributions
- Lots of features of little value if not used and require more documentation, overhead
Why contribute? (Prelim)

• Tie-in to community of fellow enthusiasts
• Ongoing conversation from own lives
• Pragmatic
• Feeling of contributing to the “brand” of the institution or community
• Enhance own reputation
Some promising areas

- Sites like Flickr to identify “mystery photos” and provide context
- CommentPress (from Future of the Book) for translating, transcribing digitized documents in different languages and scripts
- Integration of user corrections (Flickr commons, Historic Australian Newspapers - 5 million lines of OCR’d text corrected)
Leverage the *enthusiasm*

Some Steve museum tag contributor comments:

“*It's fun, interesting, educational, a ‘trip’.*”

“*Makes me feel I have a stake in the collections.*”

“*Delightfully self-aggrandizing.*”
Explore social metadata sites...

... or if you know of others the RLG Partners Social Metadata Working Group should review, go to:

oclcresearch.webjunction.org/social_metadata
Webinars

- OCLC Research Technical Advances for Innovation in Cultural Heritage Institutions (TAI CHI) Webinar Series
- Missing Materials
- EAD Barriers
- Implications of MARC Tag Usage on Library Metadata Practices
- Aggregating Social Metadata
- Archival Description Analysis
- Delivery in Special Collections
- Cameras in the Reading Room
- Scan on Demand
- Museum Data Exchange
Events

[www.oclc.org/research/events/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/research/events/default.htm)

- ALA Midwinter (various)
  15-19 January 2010, Boston, MA

- RLG Partnership European Meeting, Moving the Past into the Future: Special Collections in Digital Age
  22-23 April 2010 St Anne’s College, University of Oxford

- 2010 RLG Partnership Annual Meeting
  9-10 June 2010 Chicago, IL

- RLG Partnership Symposium, When the Books Leave the Building
  11 June 2010 Chicago, IL

- Collaboration Forum
  September 2010 (date TBD) Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC
Upcoming reports

1. Research Assessment Key Perspectives Companion Report (January 2010)
4. *Implications of MARC Tag Usage on Library Metadata Practices* (February 2010)
5. *Scan and Deliver: Digitization on Demand* (March 2010)
7. Social Metadata for Libraries, Archives and Museums (April 2010)
9. Special Collections and Archives Survey Results (June 2010)
10. *Archival Description Analysis* (June 2010)
Thank you for joining us!

Send comments to rlg@oclc.org