

## Introduction

We (Heather Moulaison and Felicity Dykas) are carrying out research into metadata practices in US-based institutions affiliated with the OpenDOAR project. Your assistance in answering this survey will help us understand how we can operationalize "quality" in regards to metadata and metadata creation in the research environment and how best institutions can self-evaluate metadata creation for the good of the information profession community.

We anticipate that this 5-part survey should take approximately 15-30 minutes to answer, depending on how much you have to share with us. Should you wish to discontinue participation, you may close your browser's window at any time.

Your responses will be confidential but will not be anonymous. We respect your privacy and will not connect your name or your institution's name with any of your answers in our results, in any publications, or in published datasets.

Should you have any questions about your right as a participant, please feel free to contact the Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri at 573-882-9585 or [umcresearchirb@missouri.edu](mailto:umcresearchirb@missouri.edu). Should you have any questions about the research, please contact Heather Lea Moulaison, [moulaisonhe@missouri.edu](mailto:moulaisonhe@missouri.edu), or Felicity Dykas, [dykasf@missouri.edu](mailto:dykasf@missouri.edu).

By continuing the survey, you are indicating that you have read this disclosure and agree to participate in the research.

Do you agree to participate?

- Yes  
 No

## I. Repository demographics

### I. Repository demographics

Your institution was selected because it has at least one repository listed in the [OpenDOAR registry](#). Some institutions have more than one repository listed.

To be clear, which OpenDOAR repository will you be describing in the answers that follow? Please provide a URL to your repository.

Name of repository

URL

What repository system/software are you using? Check all that apply.

CONTENTdm

Fedora

- Digital Commons / Bepress
- DSpace
- EPrints
- Ex Libris DigiTool
- Ex Libris Rosetta

- Hydra
- Islandora
- Omeka
- Locally developed software
- Other

**What encoding schema is used? Check all that apply.**

- |   |                                 |   |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CDWA                   | <input type="checkbox"/> MARC   | <input type="checkbox"/> TextMD                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dublin Core            | <input type="checkbox"/> MIX    | <input type="checkbox"/> VRA                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dublin Core, Qualified | <input type="checkbox"/> MODS   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> EAD                    | <input type="checkbox"/> PBCore | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ETD-MS                 | <input type="checkbox"/> PREMIS | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MADS                   | <input type="checkbox"/> TEI    |   |

**What controlled vocabularies are used? Check all that apply.**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Art & Architecture Thesaurus (AAT)                | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST) | <input type="checkbox"/> Name authority file (NAF)             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (TGN)         | <input type="checkbox"/> Thesaurus for Graphic Materials (TGM) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms (LCGFT)      | <input type="checkbox"/> Union List of Artist Names® (ULAN)    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/>            |

**What kind of content does your repository make available? Check all that apply.**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Audio               | <input type="checkbox"/> Presentations              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Born digital books  | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Databases           | <input type="checkbox"/> Research data/datasets     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Digitized books     | <input type="checkbox"/> Student projects           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ETDs                | <input type="checkbox"/> Video                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Images              | <input type="checkbox"/> Websites                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual articles | <input type="checkbox"/> White papers               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Journals            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/> |

**How many digital objects does your repository currently house?**

- 1-499
- 500-4,999
- 40,000-50,000
- 50,000-100,000

- 
- 5,000-9,999
- 10,000-19,999
- 20,000-39,999
- 
- 100,000-1,000,000
- 1,000,000+

**Responder demographics**

## II. Responder demographics

What is your professional title?

What is your educational background? Check all that apply and enter area of concentration.

- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- PhD
- 2nd Bachelor's degree
- 2nd Master's degree
- Other
- Other

What is your role related to the repository?

**III. Quality metadata**

## III. Quality metadata

Please rate the quality of your metadata by using the scale below.  
(1 poor; 2 below average; 3 average; 4 above average; 5 high)

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

---

Quality of metadata

Why did you give it this score?

How is metadata quality control carried out in your repository:

A. In individual records?

B. In projects and across collections?

C. For the overall repository?

In a perfect world, what would you do differently to ensure a higher quality of metadata?

What are the biggest obstacles to making this happen? Check all that apply.

- Repository software limitations
- Institutional priorities
- Skill levels of staff
- Time limitations and staff hours
- Concerns about interoperability

- Nature of legacy data
- Current standards meet user needs
- Lack of necessary tools
- Other

#### IV. Metadata creation environment

#### IV. Metadata creation environment

Who is involved in different aspects of metadata creation and documentation?

	Check all that apply						
	Inputs or loads metadata	Creates DESCRIPTIVE metadata	Creates ADMINISTRATIVE metadata	Reviews metadata	Establishes/selects metadata standards	Creates/selects documentation	Interprets user needs
Administrator (outside department)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisory committee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Department head	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Librarian (master's level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject specialist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Paraprofessional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student worker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volunteer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What resources are used by or prescribed for use by employees working at this repository? Check all that apply.

- Best practices: BCR
- Classification Web
- oXygen XML editor
- Best practices: RDA
- DublinCore Generator.com
- RDA Toolkit
- Best practices: homegrown
- id.loc.gov
- VIAF
- Best practices: Western States
- MARCedit
- zvon
- Best practices other
- OCLC Connexion
- Other
- Cataloger's Desktop
- ORCID

V. Perceived Need for Metadata Seal of Approval

V. Perceived Need for Metadata Seal of Approval

Would you be willing to participate in a program that helped you evaluate the quality of your metadata through self-assessment and community-based peer review of documentation/practices (i.e. a Metadata Quality Seal of Approval similar to the broader [Data Seal of Approval](#))

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Why or why not?

What strengths and weaknesses do you associate with self-assessment?

What strengths and weaknesses do you associate with community-based peer review?

Is there a benefit to community consensus on the definition of quality metadata?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Why or why not?

Is there a role for the community to step in and assist when lack of metadata puts a collection at risk?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Why or why not?

In your opinion, is it possible as a community to decide upon a minimum or core-level of repository metadata?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Why or why not?

How does metadata quality support openness and interoperability?

At what point does metadata quality hinder openness and interoperability?