

LD4P @ Columbia BIBFRAME and Art Properties



Melanie Wacker, Metadata Coordinator
Amber Billey, Metadata Librarian
Columbia University Libraries
Jan. 10, 2016

The Art Properties Collection

- Art collection owned by Columbia University
- 10,000+ works of art
- Displayed throughout the campus and held in storage
- Art Properties home page:
<http://library.columbia.edu/locations/avery/art-properties.html>



John Singleton Copley
Portrait of Myles Cooper
ca. 1768, oil on canvas



Standing Buddha, China
Northern Qi dynasty (550-577),
limestone with marble base



Florine Stettheimer
Landscape No. 2 with Bathers
1911, oil on canvas



Charles Willson Peale
*Portrait Miniature of Alexander
Hamilton, c.1780*
watercolor on ivory

Gift of Edmund Astley Prentis



Anna Hyatt Huntington
Cranes Rising, 1934, bronze

Gift of the artist



Hiroshige
The Cave Shrine of Kannon
Japan, Edo period
1855, woodblock print

Gift of Mrs. Horace Stebbins

Why BIBFRAME?

- Many libraries own art objects
- Art objects have been described in MARC
- Larger institutions often have libraries as well as museums -- lack of communication
- BIBFRAME is supposed to work with “various content models” and accommodate “different needs for resource descriptions”
(Library of Congress (2012). *Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data*. Page 15)

The Project

- Project team consisting of librarians and domain specialists
 - Amber Billey (Metadata Librarian)
 - Roberto C. Ferrari (Curator of Art Properties)
 - Kate Harcourt (Director, Original and Special Materials Cataloging)
 - Erin Petrella (Metadata Assistant)
 - Margaret Smithglass (Registrar and Digital Content Librarian, Avery Library)
 - Project Coordinator: Melanie Wacker (Metadata Coordinator)

The Project

- Objectives
 - Evaluate the suitability of the BIBFRAME model and vocabulary for describing art objects
 - Identify and document any descriptive needs of art objects that are currently not covered by BIBFRAME.
 - Evaluate other linked data ontologies and initiatives in the art domain.
 - Develop a profile for the description of art objects.
 - Convert a selection of art resources data to the Art Properties Profile
 - Engage with related projects in the museum/art library domain
 - Participate in data exchange with other partners.
 - Develop workflow to connect public facing linked data with core library functions (acquisition, inventory, circulation)
 - Evaluate the project and share recommendations

The Data

- Currently in spreadsheet format (no collection management system)
- Uses controlled vocabulary for most elements (LC/NAF, TGN, AAT)
- Contains:
 - General descriptive information (e.g. creators, classification, roles, titles, dates)
 - History of the art work (e.g. exhibition notes, provenance)
 - Acquisition information (e.g. donor, acquisition date)
 - Condition and Preservation information (e.g. condition description, condition date, conservation)
 - Location and circulation information (e.g. status, campus location)

Characterization of Sample Data

- Sample data describing 112 art objects in the Art Properties collection
 - Subset of the overall collection, so should not be seen to represent the entire collection
- Formats
- Creators
- Titles
- “Ofness” vs. “Aboutness”
- Events
- Physical Description
- Location
- Acquisitions Type Information

Literature Review

- Contemporary literature on art and linked data
- Information-seeking behavior for art and visual resources
- Non-MARC metadata schema development and modeling for art and visual resources
- Mapping descriptions for art and visual resources into MARC

Art and Linked Data

- Controlled Vocabularies and Thesauri
 - [Getty Vocabularies](#)
 - AAT, ULAN, TGN, CONA
 - [Library of Congress Linked Data Service](#)
 - NAF, LCSH, LCGFT, ...
 - [FAST](#)
- Ontologies
 - [CIDOC CRM](#)
 - [VRA RDF](#)
 - [VRA as a BIBFRAME profile](#)
- Mappings
 - Art Properties data in VRA (XML & RDF)
 - Art Properties data in LIDO (XML)
 - Schema.org (OCLC)
- Other Projects
 - [American Art Collaborative](#)

Issues Discovered

- Definition of “Work”
- Properties lacking in BIBFRAME
e.g. Culture, Inscriptions/Signatures
- Events are problematic
e.g. Lifecycle events vs. Events as topics/subjects
- Restricted information
e.g. Insurance value, exact location (such as an office), donor information, etc.

Next Steps

- Experimenting with tools: Karma and Vitro
- Continue use case development
- Reaching out to peer institutions
e.g. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs
- Continue evaluation of existing art-focused ontologies and BIBFRAME 2.0 (once released)
- Data modeling, ontology and profile development
- Data transformation/creation

Thank you!

Questions?

Melanie Wacker

mw2064@columbia.edu

Amber Billey

ab3167@columbia.edu