

## Metadata Standards: PACSL & DPLA; Minimum Standards for Archival Files

- Interaction: institution -> ArtStor -> DPLA
  - Communication re: metadata dropped
  - Designated collections
- Low participation in DPLA around table
- DPLA requires 250K images
  - Hub: Enoch Pratt coordinates others' deposit to DPLA
  - Enoch Pratt currently an aggregator; wants to become a service hub: does some digitization for other institutions.
  - Enoch Pratt creates metadata
  - Statewide conference in Maryland, inviting ArtStor, OCLC (contentDM issues)
- Variance from standards: how to limit. Any discussions? Any guidance developing?
  - Initially, ArtStor wanted content; didn't fuss about metadata.
  - Systems handle things differently
  - Material types, Asian / Western approaches to creator, etc.,
  - Many creators have limited experience in importance of standardized access
  - Photographers approach embedding metadata differently from libraries.
    - Five metadata fields (get from Phil Museum of Art representative)
  - No metadata standard to describe event (museum exhibit, e.g.), © owner (photographer vs institution)
- Object (manuscript; photographer, etc) drives some description; access needs drive others.
- Not only requiring a field, but how to interpret
  - Original creation vs date of image file vs date of analog photo
    - Object creation in Object fields (Philadelphia Museum of Art)
    - Indexing field vs description
  - How granular do you want metadata?
  - Geographic Location: Geography of content objects vs photographer's location when image taken
- If you document why you added content, successors can manipulate
- But sometimes, inconsistency intentional to address a perceived access need.
- RDA separates record for analog from record for digital.
  - Slide vs digitized file (vs original object)
    - Original images change following conservation
  - Eventually manifestations tied to super-entity (FRBR)
  - Work, expression, manifestation, item
- Born digital images
  - Date of photography
  - Two approaches to file naming conventions
    - Date,
    - unique number
  - Philadelphia Museum of Art: following Georgia convention
  - We see new attempt every couple of years
- Item-level vs collection-oriented
  - Haverford: 3 letter preferred; year; digital folder (6 digit)
  - Ranges saved for ongoing projects
  - Flexible enough that can add digits (i.e., 8 digits)
  - Or: Collection code with accretion number; sub-collections get another letter identifier
  - Shelf mark points back to original.