

February 2006

## Task One: Moving Dublin Core to MARC

Margaret Mering

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln, mmering1@unl.edu*

Charity K. Martin

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln, cmartin3@unl.edu*

Judith Wolfe

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln, jwolfe4@unl.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarywhitepapers>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

Mering, Margaret; Martin, Charity K.; and Wolfe, Judith, "Task One: Moving Dublin Core to MARC" (2006). *White Papers: University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries*. 2.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarywhitepapers/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in White Papers: University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

To: Joan Giesecke, Beth McNeil, and Mary Bolin  
From: Margaret Mering, Charity Martin, and Judith Wolfe  
Re: Task One: Moving Dublin Core to MARC  
Date: February 10, 2006

## **CHARGE**

Problem: Currently we catalog architecture slides in both MARC and ContentDM (Dublin Core)

Questions:

How can we catalog items in ContentDM and then load the data into IRIS in a MARC format with appropriate URL to access the actual images?

Also, how can we move catalog records and URLs from IRIS to ContentDM without a great deal of clean up?

Charge: Design and test a process for moving data from ContentDM to IRIS and from IRIS to ContentDM.

## **DEFINING TASK ONE**

In reviewing the charge, Committee members noted:

- Although the charge specifically says Dublin Core, the Architecture Library and the Art Department are using the Visual Resources Association's metadata scheme for records in ContentDM. VRA is an outgrowth of Dublin Core and is "designed to facilitate the sharing of information among visual resources collections about *works* and *images*." [VRA Web site]
- The Architecture slides and images are but one example of cataloging the same thing twice. Archives finding aids are cataloged first in EAD and then in MARC. The Technical Services faculty will be cataloging resources created by E-text for the Registry of Digital Masters on OCLC.
- One original concern was the Libraries' cataloging obligations to OCLC. According to an OCLC representative, including ContentDM collections in WorldCat is optional.
- A large number of Architecture slides and images have been cataloged in MARC only. Some have been cataloged for both the catalog and ContentDM using MARC and VRA. In the future, new images will be cataloged. This report will offer different solutions for these different situations.
- A number of people have expertise relating to the charge. The following people were interviewed for this report: DeeAnn Allison, Christa Burns (Nebraska Library Commission), Mark Hinchman (College of Architecture), Brian Pytlik Zillig, Stacy Rickel, Steve Sall, and Judy Winkler. We are grateful for their assistance.

## **Current Practices**

### *Cataloging*

Within the libraries online catalog, collection level bibliographic records are created for groups of architectural images using MARC and OCLC. Collection level records draw together collections of materials and take advantage of the natural relationships among images. The catalog has approximately 125,000 slides attached to about 13,000 records. About 75,000 of these slides have been digitized and are attached to the corresponding records.

ContentDM currently contains collections that have been purchased from publishers, survey sets and digital images of owned slides. The images are cataloged individually rather than as collection level records or compound images in ContentDM. A limited number of images are cataloged both in ContentDM and in the catalog. For a decorative arts collection, the MARC collection level record was used to develop individual ContentDM records.

### *Server*

ContentDM images are housed as individual files on a library server. Images from MARC collection level records are organized in folders and are stored on the Frontier server. Collections cataloged in the OPAC and in ContentDM are located on both servers.

Transferring images from the Frontier server to the library server is a time consuming activity. Folders created for the Frontier server must be dismantled before individual image files can be transferred to the library's server. (Appendix A)

## **Cataloging/Metadata Alternatives – Pros and cons**

### *One-to-One*

1. A MARC record would be created manually for each image for the online catalog and a VRA record would be created for ContentDM. Data would be similar for both the VRA and the MARC records. (Appendix B)

#### **Pros:**

Consistency between ContentDM and OCLC  
Possible option for newly cataloged images  
Would result in high-quality records for both ContentDM and OCLC  
Users able to easily browse through images

#### **Cons:**

Duplication of effort  
Is it necessary or desirable to have individual records both in the catalog and ContentDM?  
Not a practical or a possible option for already cataloged images  
Very idealistic, ignores human error  
Would not provide access to new images in a timely manner  
Long term project, a black hole of energy and time

2. ContentDM collections can be registered with OCLC's WorldCat by using one of the export options available through ContentDM Administration functions. OCLC would contact the Libraries to complete the process of reviewing and approving the loading of records into WorldCat. According to Christa Burns, NEBASE Member Services Coordinator, "OCLC tries to load these files within 90 days of harvest, as they are basically a batch load project." Currently, OCLC does not charge for this service.

**Pros:**

This alternative may be a way to create records for local collections that need to be part of the Registry of Digital Masters. We could decide whether to have the records only in OCLC and not in the catalog. If we did not choose to have individual records in the catalog, we could have a doorway record.

Could save some staff time

Training for data entry would be easier

**Cons:**

The quality of OCLC harvested records is unknown.

The amount of maintenance the records would need is also not known.

90 days seems like a long time to wait for OCLC to create records.

*Doorway records in the catalog*

For our purposes, a doorway record is a navigational tool used to direct the user from the online catalog to ContentDM. The catalog record would include an URL connecting to the collection in ContentDM. The doorway record is not meant to be as detailed or as specific as a collection level record. For example, currently within the catalog, a content note (MARC 505) is being used to identify individual images in collection level records. The contents note can be very lengthy and labor intensive to construct and can require upkeep. For a doorway record, a brief summary note (MARC 520) instead of a detailed contents note (MARC 505) would be created to describe the collection. A doorway record can be compared to a museum and its collections. The museum has many rooms to various collections. Each doorway leads you to a specific collection. A doorway records is the information equivalent of a museum's collections.

**Pros:**

Improve traffic to ContentDM

Easier navigation from online catalog to ContentDM

Aids in migration from catalog to ContentDM

Would allow for standardization of records for both catalog and ContentDM

**Cons:**

Communication network would have to be developed between projects

**1. Doorway records in the catalog/Individual records in ContentDM**

A MARC doorway catalog record would be created for each collection. Individual VRA records for each image in a collection would be created for ContentDM. Image level detail would be found within the ContentDM record, not within the Doorway catalog record. This option would apply to newly cataloged images. (Appendix C)

**Pros:**

Allows for specific information and subject headings for each image in ContentDM.  
Users able to easily browse through images in ContentDM

**Con:**

Labor intensive to create metadata for each image in ContentDM; would not provide access to new images in a timely manner

**2. Doorway records in the catalog/Compound Image records in ContentDM**

A MARC doorway catalog record would be created for collections. A compound image record would be created for ContentDM. The metadata in ContentDM would be more detailed than for the Doorway record in the catalog. This option would apply to newly cataloged images

**Pros:**

Gathers collections together; highlights relationships between images in ContentDM  
Not as labor intensive as other options  
Fewer records to create

**Cons:**

Does not allow for specific information and subject headings for each image in ContentDM  
At initial level of display, only possible to view one thumbnail of one image of the collection. Viewing other images of collections is somewhat cumbersome.  
Other technical problems

*Collections already cataloged in MARC***1. Collection level records in the catalog/Individual records in ContentDM**

During the last year, CORS and the Architecture Visual Resource Manager harvested data from MARC collection level records in the catalog to create individual VRA metadata records in ContentDM for a decorative arts collection. One challenge they faced was harvesting data from a collection level records to create metadata for multiple single image records in ContentDM. Creating the individual metadata records involved a lot of clean up and was very time consuming.

Further clean up on the subject headings for the decorative arts collection in ContentDM is still needed. All subject headings used for a MARC collection level record were also applied to each VRA single image metadata record. Not all subjects applied to each image. Below is the metadata for an Axminster rug. Mirror and Tableware are not appropriate subject headings for this image. Incorrect subject headings are misleading to patrons trying to find a certain image.

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                       | <u>Adam style decorative arts</u>   |
| <b>Description</b>                 | <u>Axminster rugs</u>   |
| <b>Subject</b>                     | <u>Decorative arts -- England -- 18th century</u><br><u>Rugs -- England -- 18th century</u><br><u>Mirrors -- England -- 18th century</u><br><u>Tableware -- England -- 18th century</u> |
| <b>School/Style</b>                | <u>Adam style</u>   |
| <b>Image.Classification Number</b> | M371A A325W D426  |
| <b>Copyright Information</b>       | <u><a href="http://0-www.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/libArch/copyright.html">http://0-www.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/libArch/copyright.html</a></u>  |

For this option to work, modification of what is harvested from MARC is need, as are compromises on the level of detail in the metadata for each image in ContentDM. Cataloging practice for architectural images would need to revisited. For example, a decision could be made to have more general subject headings as well as fewer subject headings. Switching the title and the description fields in the metadata record would result in a more accurate description of the image being displayed.

**Pros:**

Once all the wrinkles are worked out, this option could save staff time.  
Allows for specific information and subject headings for each image in ContentDM.  
Users able to easily browse through images in ContentDM

**Cons:**

Revisiting cataloging practice could be time consuming  
Not as much access to aspects of images in ContentDM

**2. Collection level records in the catalog /Compound Image records in ContentDM**

The existing MARC collection record would be kept. A compound record would be created for collections in ContentDM.

**Pros:**

Gathers collections together; highlights relationships between images in ContentDM  
Not as labor intensive as other options  
Fewer records to create

**Cons:**

Does not allow for specific information and subject headings for each image  
At initial level of display, only possible to view one thumbnail of one imagine of the collection. Viewing other images of collections is somewhat cumbersome.  
Unknown how MARC records would be harvested to create VRA collection level records.  
Other technical problems

## **Server Alternatives – Pros and cons**

For previously uncataloged collections, images would only be stored on the libraries' server. Include a URL in the MARC catalog record that links directly to ContentDM.

### **Pros:**

Images would be stored in one location only  
Would involve less staff time

### **Cons:**

Might limit access to images for some users

## **COMMUNICATION**

### **Communication on same tasks**

Some projects have multiple library departments and university departments working on different aspects of the same project. One example is the Miniature Furniture project (Eloise Kruger Collection). Amber Mohr from the Architecture Department is responsible for the content and image creation. E-Text is responsible for loading the material into content DM. The Architecture Library is responsible for creating MARC records for the online catalog. Currently, 55 images are in ContentDM, and 39 are in the catalog. Material is added as received by E-Text and cataloged at the individual piece level. More communication between library departments would help coordinate these tasks. For the sake of consistency of records in all collections, the working group recommends that standards for ContentDM records and a partnership with cataloging and metadata specialists, including Technical Services faculty, be established.

### **Communication between committees –**

Currently, three committees are reviewing aspects of ContentDM and metadata. Including a liaison from each committee from respective committees could improve communication and eliminate duplication of effort.

## **MISSION OF CONTENTdm AND CATALOG**

Although not mentioned in the charge or presented as a problem, the group came to realize that one of the underlying issues was a lack of clarity concerning what the purpose and scope of both the catalog and of ContentDM.

Librarians are very familiar with the argument about ownership and access as it affects the catalog. Most libraries have settled on the access side of the debate. However, other questions remain to be answered. For example, what level of access should be provided? Is the catalog a catchall? In that case, why don't we have records at the article level for serials or the chapter level for books? If it is decided to include even brief records in IRIS for individual images, is this not the same level of cataloging at the article level? How do we point users to the resources they are looking for?

On the other hand, the content within IRIS has been changing. More and more monographic records include contents notes listing chapter titles. We are purchasing bibliographic records for large collections such as ECCO and History E-book. The

interoperability between full-text journal databases, indexes and the online catalog (as found with OCLC) has been increasing.

Another problem we encountered was that no one we spoke to really seemed to have an overall understanding of the purpose of ContentDM. Is it a teaching tool, there to assist with PowerPoint slides, or a holding area for images? Do we image the average user (not faculty in the particular subject area) accessing ContentDM much like they access the catalog? The way different collections have been cataloged has resulted in inconsistency with regard to access points and content.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Review MARC cataloging practice for Architectural slides and images in light of ContentDM.
- The online catalog should primarily be a navigational tool to direct users to the image collection found within ContentDM.
- Metadata in ContentDM should be simplified and less detailed.
- Use doorway records in the online catalog
- Establish standards for ContentDM which may include a use of a template to provide consistency and clarity to metadata. These standards need to strike a balance between the quality of the data and the subject and other expertise of the inputters/catalogers. In establishing standards, we encourage borrowing from other best practice documents which have been previously written. See URLs below:

Colorado Digitization Project--update of Western States Best Practices  
<http://www.cdpheritage.org/cdp/documents/CDPDCMBP.pdf>

Western Trails  
<http://www.nlc.state.ne.us/westerstrails/metadata.pdf>

Nebraska Memories Project  
<http://www.nlc.state.ne.us/nebraskamemories/metadata.pdf>

- Prioritize previously MARC cataloged collections. Decide staffing and levels of staffing required to do the work. Determine ContentDM collections that need to be access through the online catalog and which do not. Evaluate which ContentDM collections need just compound image metadata and which need metadata for each and every image.
- For new collections, only store images on the Libraries' server, not on the Frontiers server. Provide a link in the doorway record to ContentDM.
- Investigate registering local ContentDM collections with OCLC's WorldCat
- Establish a partnership between metadata and ContentDM specialists, including Technical Services faculty, Etext, relevant staff in the library as well as non-library departments.



Appendix A

Sample of MARC to VRA

ContentDM Record

Mirror



**Description** Adam style decorative arts  
**Subject** Drawing, convex mirror  
Decorative arts -- England -- 18th century  
Rugs -- England -- 18th century  
Mirrors -- England -- 18th century  
Tableware -- England -- 18th century

**School/Style** Adam style  
**Image.Classification Number** M371A A325W D426  
**Copyright Information** <http://0-www.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/libArch/copyright.html>

MARC Record

```

LEADER 00000ngc 2200000Ia 4500
001 48196320
007 gs mj--jk
008 011023s19uu xx nnn sn d
040 LDL|cLDL
043 e-uk-en
049 [SLIDE] LDLH
A.C. Mirror099 M371A|aA325W|aD426
245 00 [Adam style decorative arts]|h[slide]
260 |c[19--]
300 8 slides :|bb&w and col
505 0 A.A. Soup tureen -- A.B. Wine cooler -- A. C. Mirror --
A.D. Gilt looking glass (ca. 1760) -- A.E-A.F. Axminster
rugs -- A.G. Fireplace gates -- V.A. Drawing, convex
mirror
530 Also available in digital format
650 0 Decorative arts|zEngland|y18th century|vSlides
650 0 Rugs|zEngland|y18th century|vSlides
650 0 Mirrors|zEngland|y18th century|vSlides
650 0 Tableware|zEngland|y18th century|vSlides
655 Digital images
856 41 |uhttp://0-www.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/libArch/48196320/
index.html
910 RH270c03JAW

```

## VRA Record



|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                        | <b><u>ABBAYE FONTFROIDE</u></b>  |
| <b>Alternate Title/Translation</b>  | <b><u>Frontfroide Abbey</u></b>  |
| <b>View</b>                         | Court of Honor (1777-78), looking towards the back   |
| <b>Purpose</b>                      | <b><u>religious</u></b>  |
| <b>Work Type</b>                    | <b><u>Cistercian abbey</u></b><br><b><u>monastery</u></b><br><b><u>church</u></b><br><b><u>religious complex</u></b><br><b><u>castrum</u></b>  |
| <b>Style/Period</b>                 | <b><u>Romanesque</u></b><br><b><u>Gothic</u></b>   |
| <b>Major Design Aspects</b>         | <b><u>complex of various buildings</u></b><br><b><u>organic growth over time</u></b>   |
| <b>Elements &amp; Spatial Types</b> | <b><u>court</u></b><br><b><u>cloister</u></b>  |
| <b>Climate Type</b>                 | Mediterranean  |
| <b>Country</b>                      | <b><u>France</u></b>   |
| <b>City</b>                         | <b><u>near Narbonne</u></b>  |
| <b>Architectural Material</b>       | <b><u>stone</u></b>  |
| <b>Dates</b>                        | 1093 through 18C   |
| <b>Century</b>                      | 11C-18C  |
| <b>Subject Information</b>          | The Cistercian Abbey of Fontfroide is located 30km southwest of Narbonne, France, and was begun in 1093 under the authorization of the Viscount Aymeric 11 of Narbonne. Details of the origins of the abbaye remain sketchy but the name of the abbey is connected to the ""fons frigida"", a highly protected source of water in the vicinity. The monks living in the monastery broke their traditional solitude during the rise of catharism in this area and built ""castrums"" or protective fortresses in the vicinity to ensure their survival during this period of religious upheaval. Fontfroide played a major role during the crusades and served to protect Catholic interests. The building was built in such a fashion that the Cistercian monks who practiced austerity in all aspects of their lives did not have to connect with the outside world. Accordingly the garden, the mill and even the water system were all accessible within the confines of the monastery. In order to cultivate more efficiently the local land, the monks developed a series of barns in the area that were operated by a second category of monks who were manual laborers or ""illetrati"" but who did not have the superior spiritual value of their literate brothers. During the 13th and 14th centuries the monastery was in full expansion due in large part to the financial contribution of Olivier de Termes who some believe is buried in the cemetery of the Abbey. The monastery began its decline in the 15th century when papal authority gave less power to the monks to run their property and transferred control to a series of families from the 1500's to the 1700's. These various families put their personal touches on the monastery including an Italian-inspired garden in the Court of Honor believed to have been added in the early to mid 1600's. In 1764, Louis the 14th put an end to this land title system and the monastery passed to the local diocese. By the end of the 1700's, the monks had strayed from their austere origins and were in the business of making money from the many foods and wines that they produced. The Romanesque architecture was Inc.reasingly modified in good taste by the monks who greatly embellished the complex. After the French Revolution, the abbey became the property of the state and any revenue generated went to the hospices of Narbonne. As money depleted, architectural elements of the building were sold off until it was eventually sold to private interests by the Narbonne hospices. Viollet-le-Duc had the abbey classed as a national monument in 1843. In 1858 a small group of Cisternian monks inhabited the Monastery again beginning in 1901 was again sold to a series of private owners including the present one who lives on the property but allows the visiting public entry to the monastery. Researched for Archivision by Claude Picard |
| <b>Credit Line</b>                  | Archivision Inc. (all images © Scott Gilchrist / Archivision.com)  |

MARC Record

LEADER 00000nkc 2200373Ia 45 0  
001 61284399  
007 cr cn-----  
008 050818s200u oncnns ineng d  
040 LDL|cLDL  
043 e-fr---  
049 [INTERNET] LDLL  
099 K397A|aN372S.A|aF766  
245 00 Abbaye Fontfroide, Narbonne, France|h[electronic resource]  
260 Toronto, Ont., Canada :|bArchivision,|c[200-?]  
500 Title from accompanying material (viewed August 15, 2005)  
500 Built 1093-ca. 1900  
500 24 black and white and color images ; photographed 1999  
500 1A2-F-AF  
505 0 A1. View towards entry to Court of Honor (1777-1778) --  
A2. Looking towards the back of the Court -- A3. Main door  
leading to the Rectory -- A4. Main door and adjacent  
windows -- A5. Windows near main door -- AA1. Plan of the  
abbey -- B1. General view of courtyard (1775, Louis XIV  
style) -- B2. Monk lodging wall -- B3. Lodging wall --  
C1. Cloister (1180-1210), with 12th century abbey church  
behind -- C2. Cloister -- C3. Cloister -- C4. Cloister  
wall -- C5. Vaulted ceiling of cloister -- C6. Cloister  
passageway -- C7. Cloister interior -- D1. Abbey church,  
as viewed over the garden -- D2. Facade, garden elevation  
-- D3. Stained glass window -- D4. Another window -- E1.  
Church portal -- E2. Portal detail -- E3. Portal tympanum  
-- F1. Distant view of castrum (protective fortress)  
538 Mode of Access: World Wide Web  
610 20 Fontfroide (Abbey : Narbonne, France)  
650 0 Cistercian monasteries|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Church buildings|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Church architecture|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Windows|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Cloisters (Architecture)|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Doorways|zFrance|zNarbonne  
650 0 Fortification|zFrance|zNarbonne  
651 0 Narbonne (France)|xBuildings, structures, etc  
655 Digital images  
856 41 |uhttp://0-www.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/libArch/Archivision  
/61284399/index.html  
910 18AG05SKBjaw  
4 of the 24 images linked to MARC record in the 505 field



A1. View towards entry to Court of Honor



A2. Looking towards the back of the Court



A3. Main door leading to the Rectory



A4. Main door and adjacent windows

## Appendix C

### Sample of Doorway Record

```
LEADER 00000nkc 2200373Ia 45 0
001 61284399
007 cr cn-----
008 050818s200u oncnnn s ineng d
040 LDL|cLDL
043 e-fr---
049 [INTERNET] LDLL
099 K397A|aN372S.A|aF766
245 00 Abbaye Fontfroide, Narbonne, France|h[electronic resource]
260 Toronto, Ont., Canada :|bArchivision,|c[200-?]
500 Title from accompanying material (viewed August 15, 2005)
500 Built 1093-ca. 1900
500 24 black and white and color images ; photographed 1999
520 The Cistercian Abbey of Fontfroide is located 30km southwest of Narbonne,
France, and was begun in 1093 under the authorization of the Viscount Aymeric 11 of
Narbonne.
538 Mode of Access: World Wide Web
610 20 Fontfroide (Abbey : Narbonne, France)
655 Digital images
856 41 |uhttp://2000-contentdm.unl.edu.library.unl.edu/cdm4/browse.php?archivision
911 18AG05SKBjaw
```