



NJVid Joint Meeting of the Locally-Owned Content, Metadata and IPC Workgroups

July 21, 2008 – 2 PM – William Paterson University

MINUTES

Present in-person: Isaiah Beard, Sharon Favaro, Judy Jeng, Jane Hutchison, Martha Loesch, Sandie Miller, Mary Mallery, Tom Nemeth, Sheri Prupis, Mark Sandford, Marcia Sexton, Mary Beth Weber, Bob Wolk

Present by phone: Laura Barrett, Matthew Conforth, Erika Gorder

Laura’s Proposal of a field for Authority:

Laura proposed having a field where a guest speaker or similar individual’s credentials would be listed – For example, for a guest lecture given by a medical practitioner at Johns Hopkins Medical Center, his/her professional affiliation would be listed in the proposed Authority field – The group’s conclusion was to put this information in the optional Name field along with director/producer, production company, etc. Additional “authority”-type information could be placed in the “General all-purpose notes” field if needed.

Running Time of Segmented Videos:

Upon entering a running time for a video and later segmenting that video into learning objects, would the running time have to be adjusted to reflect each of the objects’ running times, or does the metadata describe the video as a whole without reference to each individual object that has been created? Isaiah responded that running time entered for source metadata is meant to describe the overall video, whereas technical metadata describes each segmented object. Since Isaiah will be entering technical metadata, each institution itself will not have to add running times for each segmented object it creates. (How will Isaiah know what segments the institution wants to create the object technical metadata for? Also, how will this work for students creating segments? How can Isaiah enter metadata for that? Will the student-created segments reside on their local computers?)

Terms & Conditions:

Terms & Conditions for using NJVid need to be added to the Web site. By participating in NJVid, users implicitly agree to abide by the terms and conditions laid out therein.

Presentation format:

Discussion of whether to restrict access via a choice of streaming-only or download with remix and reuse permitted. An option to select download with no alterations of the downloaded content was also agreed upon – A critical snag to enabling widespread streaming-only access is that some institutions do not have the downstream bandwidth necessary to support streaming-only access – File format for streaming is .mov, and file format for progressive download is .flv encased in a Shockwave wrapper – License terms will state licensors agree to make their materials available by “any digital means” – Upon receiving a notification of copyright infringement, the material will be removed and can be counter-challenged by the providing institution under penalty of perjury per the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

Deed of Gift:

Erika is working on a sample deed of gift that will act as an agreement between the donor and the institution – can only really be used with NJVid if it explicitly permits reformatting of the donated material

Condition Assessment of Physical Materials:

Erika is also working on guidelines that institutions can follow to assess the physical condition of their materials, such as that of video tapes – Erika said it can be difficult even for trained professionals to assess the condition of tape stock – One can check for sticky-shed syndrome, where the tape discards its magnetic track during playback due to weakened strength of the adhesive that binds the magnetic substance to the tape. Tapes exhibiting sticky-shed can potentially ruin tape decks during playback – We can place an opt-in statement within the Workflow Management System so that institutions have to assert they have reason to believe their materials provided for digitization are in sturdy physical condition to the best of their knowledge. They can certify the tapes have been played recently in full before offering them for digitization.

Review of Metadata Deposit Form:

The fields listed in the Metadata Deposit Form were reviewed – Within Descriptive Metadata, the “Language” field should indicate whether the material has sound or is silent – It is the responsibility of the institutions to remove the sound from their material if they want it to be digitized without a soundtrack.

Source Metadata will act as a record of the source material that was digitized; recorded for provenance and preservation purposes. A “Running Time” field is to be added within Source Metadata.

Technical Metadata should include the presentation format. Isaiah will enter Technical Metadata and it will not appear on the Metadata Deposit Form.

Rights Metadata: Rights statement will include rights holder information, a system-generated statement

ID, and a hard-coded rights statement that will be presented as an opt-in for institutions – Copyright status will be presented as a set of dropdown items to choose from. Institutions should be equipped to make an accurate choice of drop-down after following the decision tree developed by Grace Agnew and Jeanne Boyle, which was briefly reviewed during the meeting (there should be a link to the Decision Tree) – Item availability status will include such information as whether the work is copyrighted or in public domain – Within Rights Metadata, institutions will have the option of including PDF scans of their rights documents, including nonexclusive license forms and related rights forms.

Suggested Optional Elements: No changes other than that mentioned above for “Name” field.

Meeting adjourned.