

APPENDIX 1 - DATA SCHEMA & CONTENT STANDARDS

This section discusses data schema and data content standards, how data content applies to an established schema, and how standards can cross-walk or translate with each other. To begin, we start with an analogy:

A recipe tells us what dish we're making. It contains a total list of required ingredients and may even recommend some optional "add-on" ingredients for the dish. The recipe dictates what ingredients are used and when they should be added.

If data schema is our recipe, then the data content for each field is the ingredients.

In order to make the best recipe, the ingredients need to be of the best quality and prepared according to the instructions, i.e. what format the ingredients have to be in—chopped, sliced, cubed, etc. The ingredients can be used for any recipe that calls for them, meaning data content standards can be used with various data schema.

Data Schema: Our Recipe

To begin, it's important to understand which data schema is currently used (or will be used) in your Collections Management System (CMS). This is the framework of your data.

DCMI: Dublin Core™ Metadata Element Set is the Most Widely Adopted Schema

Cultural heritage organizations often contain collections that span the traditional library, archives, and museum collections. This reality is partly why the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set²⁷ is the most universally adopted, with its straightforward approach to capturing core data across all collection types. It's also the de-facto standard schema to support Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH)—the ability to have collection data "harvested" and placed in a collaborative portal.

Data Content: Our Ingredients

Given the typical collection types for Oregon heritage organizations, this guidebook references the two most popular content standards: [Describing Archives: A Content Standard](#) (DACS)²⁸ for archival materials and [Cataloging Cultural Objects](#) (CCO)²⁹ for museum artifacts. To inform what content goes into the catalog and how, please refer to either of these common content standards.

²⁷ DCMI: Dublin Core™ Metadata Element Set, Version 1.1, accessed February 15, 2023, via <https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dces/>.

²⁸ The Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)*, Version 2019.0.3. accessed February 28, 2023, via Link: https://files.archivists.org/pubs/DACS_2019.0.3_Version.pdf.

²⁹ Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO), *A Guide to Describing Cultural Works and Their Images*, accessed February 28, 2023, via <https://vraweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/CatalogingCulturalObjectsFullv2.pdf>.

For reference, here are the most common data schema and data content standards for libraries, archives, and museums:

<p>Data Schema</p> <p>aka</p> <p>The Recipe</p>	<p>Libraries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) Format Bibliographic Framework (BIBFRAME) 	<p>Archives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dublin Core (DC) Metadata Element Set Encoded Archival Description (EAD) Visual Resources Association (VRA) Core Categories 	<p>Museums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dublin Core (DC) Metadata Element Set Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA) Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS)
<p>Data Content</p> <p>aka</p> <p>The Ingredients</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR) International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) International Standard Archival Description (ISAD) Resource Description and Access (RDA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO) CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model (CRM)

The Data Crosswalk

To crosswalk data is to relate individual standards to one another. The following table illustrates how the Dublin Core schema (recipe) utilizes the data content standards (ingredients) from both DACS and CCO. This table also highlights how multiple content standards relate, making it possible to catalog mixed collection types within one system. For example, a historical society that wants to catalog its museum artifacts in the same system as the archival collections. It also means that data from both archives and museums can be harvested and contributed to a collaborative portal filled with mixed collection types. As with any standard, both CCO and DACS suggest required and recommended (or “added value”) content fields. This table captures the requirements for each with a few highly prioritized recommended areas.

*Note: The numbers that follow each DACS or CCO standard are to indicate the chapter identification of that standard in the over-standards guide. An in-depth guide using DACS with examples can be found in **Appendix 2 – Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) Reference**.*

Dublin Core Fields	DACS Content Standard	CCO Content Standard
Identifier		
Publisher	Name and Location of Repository Element (2.2); Reference Code Element (2.1)	Repository Numbers (21.2.3)
Title	Title Element (2.3)	Title (3.1)
Creator	Name of Creator(s) Element (2.6); Administrative/Biographical History Element (2.7 added value)	Creator (4.1); Creator Role (4.1.1)
Date	Date Element (2.4)	Creation Date (4.2)
Type	Extent Element (2.5)	Work Type (1.2)
Description	Scope and Content Element (3.1)	Subject Matter (16)
	Conditions Governing Access Element (4.1)	
Language	Languages and Scripts of the Material Element (4.5)	
Subject	Access points (See Overview of Archival Description)	Subject (16.2); Classification (2.1)
Rights	Conditions Governing Reproductions and Use (4.4 added value)	
Relation	Related Archival Materials (6.3 added value)	
Format		Measurement (6); Materials and Techniques (7.1)

RESOURCE: *The following resource comprehensively accounts for data schema and content standards. Jenn Riley, *Glossary of Metadata Standards Content*, published 2009, <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/us/>. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States License and was funded by the Indiana University Libraries White Professional Development Award.*