

DLESE Quality Workshop: June 30 to July 1,2003

Proto-recommendations on:

## PROCEDURES & IMPLEMENTATION

Implication: Stating what we want in terms of "what DLESE favors" implies that we will need funded gatherers for the foreseeable future (either gathering individual resources or building collections). "The community" of volunteer resource contributors acting on its own through the open cataloger is not likely to create a library that aligns with the attributes that "DLESE favors".

Implication: these guidelines would result in deaccessioning about 100 items (Holly's guesstimate).

Chris: if criteria had been in place, many problem resources would not have been gathered and cataloged

Holly: if new criteria were in place, current QA process would have caught many of the problematic resources.

Number of resources is one factor that people consider in deciding whether to use DLESE; if change of guidelines results in slower growth of resource number, we may need to reconsider usage goals.

....leaving room for human decision-making.....

.....subject specialist comes into play if there is a questioned resource

..... subject specialist views each resource?????

## Review Board

for all resources? or marginal resources?

(Marginal as identified by current QA process)

All marginal resources + a sampling of the rest  
paid staff? or volunteers like journal Assoc Editor?

We recommend that it be a paid activity

Themed collections also, or community collection only?

DLESE reserves the right to

Themed collection + community collection

Is the Review Board for all criteria?

## Procedures for Community Collection

(= resources that arrive item by item, either from Chris/Sharon or community cataloger)

- current QA system would keep eyes out for problematic resources
- problematic resources would be referred to a Review Board (post-cataloging, pre-ingestion)
- Review Board would be make recommendation to the Collections Committee about whether or not to accession that item
- item would be or not be accessioned following Collection Committee decision.
- Collection Committee should seek to learn from consideration of these specific problem cases to refine criteria, outreach message, etc.
- Evaluation of this process: The Review Board samples a subset of the accessioned resources to test if problematic resources are sneaking through.

Do we want to retroactively look at existing resources in Broad Collection against the new criteria, and consider deaccessing resources that no longer apply? Yes, but no criticism of prior collecting process is implied by this action.

Flag specific resources?

We recommend further exploration of the capability for something like a "Point of View" designation (icon or verbal).

\* by annotation service? advantage is that if we used annotation we can apply this to resources from

\* in description field in the existing metadata framework?

\* in description field within the first 200 characters?

\* in the subject field of existing metadata ("controversial topic")

\* in a new metadata field?

\* tell Katy we want this info in the metadata somewhere and she figure out where to put it. maybe "educational description"

Are we branding the resource or are we branding the context?

If we flag, all biases should be equally flagged (Green Peace and Coal Institute).

Developmental capability for encapsulating the educational context of problematic resources without accessioning them (Bad Science model).