For your 30-minute presentation please prepare to **explain the importance of good metadata in making the library's electronic and digital resources discoverable**. Feel free to draw on past projects you've been involved in to provide **examples of what good and bad metadata look like**.

UH West Oʻahu

ʻUluʻulu

World Medicine Institue

HSPLS

Dateline Media

Hanahauʻoli

Shangri-La

APIM

Hi everybody. Thank you for coming to hear me talk about metadata and stuff. Um, for those of you that don't know me, [**CLICK**] my name is Sadie. I've worked in this library a number of times before, in the lovely SciTech Reference department. I am not from Hawaiʻi. I was born into Northeast Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which is on the other side of a large island somewhere across the ocean. But I came here about 14 years ago, shortly after the big flood, specifically for library school to learn all about the science of libraries and information, which I am now apparently a master of. So, and anyway, in this presentation I'm going to kind of riff off the theme of "good" and "bad" metadata, and how metadata can be used to impact discoverability.

Now, there are a bunch of points I want to bring into play here, and I might jump around a bit during this presentation and throw out ideas as they come up, not necessarily to make an argument always, but to bring up questions that I find interesting and worthwhile and that I would want considered by anyone that is setting metadata policy or implementing metadata practices that will impact members of our community. I don't know how much of this talk will be me

explaining to you the importance of metadata for accessing electronic resources, except to say at the start, that if your primary vehicle for accessing library resources is a single search bar, the results will be entirely dependent on the breadth and accuracy of the metadata attached to your various records, which are going to come from lots of different sources, which complicates matters. But yeah, "Good" metadata is important. [**CLICK**]

Um, yeah. But even that said, I do also feel like librarians and archivists and serious researchers are going to make use of whatever is available regardless of quality, and learn how to meet their needs using the tools they have, which might include bad metadata. However, of course, a person with less investment or exposure to our information systems, will probably be satisfied (or profoundly unsatisfied) with whatever comes up in initial search query attempts, and a great deal of valuable information might remain hidden from such folks. And um, this kind of dynamic is an idea that has come into focus a little bit for me in my current temp hire job at the Hawaiʻi State Public

Library System (Mānoa Branch), and just seeing the difference between, like, staff and public views of the Horizon catalog and just how bad both can be at parsing and displaying metadata, and the importance of knowing how the systems work in order to better find what you are looking for. And while the staff modules clearly have better functionality, a large part of finding resources for patrons still lies in knowing where the system fails and being able to work with or around those failures. And then this kind of making-do approach that humans inside of systems often take was kind of reinforced for me in a conference panel I dropped in on this weekend (for a professional association that happened to be in town) and a discussion of how substandard resources given to prisoners by the State are repurposed to actually fit the needs of the folks inside of these very oppressive systems. Which, I guess, for us in the library metadata world, you can transpose to the quality of metadata we get from the different electronic resources and library systems vendors, which often times we have no control over, and which we might have to struggle to get or to manipulate into something that is actually useful to

our needs. So, we might not be able to have good metadata all the time, but we can often times make do with what we have, as we advocate for better resources and systems that are actually suited to our needs as human persons. All of this is then again complicated of course, for the aforementioned folks who are not going to become expert users of our discovery tools, but also is complicated further when moving towards discovery tools that are perhaps more opaque in their operation and in which the functionality of the system is confusing and perhaps not clear even to the library staff itself (that may or may not be an Alma reference). So here I might note, while I am, in general, certainly a proponent of greater accessibility (in a variety of ways in which that term can be interpreted), and trying to make our discovery tools as easy to use as possible, I am not a proponent of designing information systems that aim to completely eliminate the need for human interaction. [**CLICK**]

I find value in having folks who are experts in how information systems work and can help guide others while they navigating these systems (which, you know,

I'm obviously describing librarians and archivists here, for example). Um, but I don't think that "good" metadata can be a replacement for folks who have an informed grasp of the collections that "good" metadata might describe, even if I do think it is obvious that the quality of metadata can make things easier or harder on the discovery process itself. So, important to keep in mind the ways in which our metadata is mediated through our various discovery tools, which includes library staff. [**CLICK**]

And I'll also note here that good metadata is metadata that you have control over. That won't disappear due to the whims of a for profit corporation, let's say, or the level of access to which can also change at a moments notice. Or that might be used towards purposes that are antithetical to our library's values. Often times this might be out of our control, but I would say that, when possible, it is good to make choices that give you control and flexibility in how your metadata operates. [**CLICK**]
So I kind of touched on how metadata is always mediated, and how, when it comes to quality, there is

really no way to separate metadata out from the systems in which they are accessed. That is, the quality of metadata is always going to be contextual and relational. A cataloger, you know, can spend their lives beautifying and perfecting the most astoundingly artistic set of metadata your viewing organs have ever seen, but if the rest of us are using for access some clunky and limited software whose fields and functionality do not map onto or utilize that metadata set in any meaningful way, then this metadata might not be "good" in our particular context.

But of course, this brings up another point to keep in mind, which is change. [**CLICK**]

Systems, worlds, community needs, these all change over time, so designing for a particular software that is currently in use is not necessarily always the best plan of action. And maybe we'll come back to this later, but I would definitely recommend that folks design their systems with an eye towards living in the future worlds that we actually want to live in.

Which, I guess, brings me to another point that I want to bring up. [**CLICK**]

And that is that metadata that makes a library or archive's electronic resources and digital collections discoverable does not necessarily make this metadata "good" in and of itself. Metadata can be used for all sorts of nefarious purposes, such as helping implement, enforce, and reinforce systems that throw children in cages, or murder people from the sky, or just all around contribute to the dispossession of peoples from their lands and families and cultures, etc. and so on. Actually, let's expand on this a bit.

[**CLICK**]

It's Not Your Right To Know [play song]

Sorry that was the dance party portion of the talk. Anyway, although that song is probably not specifically about academic institutions, I'm going to apply it to academia in general and even the underlying purpose of this university, which I think is currently (perhaps always?) in flux and a site for struggle. I think there is a certain history of the university's function as very much an institution of extraction and settler-colonialism, and only more recently a claim to be both an indigenous serving institution and one that is

grounded in indigenous values. Putting aside how you might feel about that, I think it is uncontroversial to point out that academia itself, and furthering the objectives of academic institutions, is not necessarily, and certainly has not always been in the past, a "good" in and of itself. When preparing for this presentation, and thinking about what is "good" metadata, I thought of what "good" metadata would mean in the context of Hawaiʻi and the university of Hawaiʻi. And, while I'm still relatively new here, and certainly no expert in Hawaiian Studies, one idea I've come across is that sometimes there are specific methods for which one should go about acquiring certain knowledge or information. Just an example of what that might look like off the top of my head, I know in New Zealand Aotearoa there are certain protocols involved with accessing some archival materials that might involve different iwi, or that a cultural expert, for example, would accompany certain films from the film archive when they were screened in different locations. But anyway, after preparing this talk, I realized last night that I probably should reread [**CLICK**]

E Naʻauao Pū, E Noiʻi Pū, E Noelo Pū: Research Support for Hawaiian Studies, which was put out by your colleagues in the UH System, and which it turns out, has multiple sections speaking to these very issues in very interesting and illuminating ways. Like talking about the importance of digital resources for accessing information and the importance of improving discoverability, but then also how there are sometimes negative consequences, and perhaps a need for a discussion of what should be noa (open) and what should be kapu (restricted). Anyway, section 5.1 Digitization and Digital Access, and section 5.2 Access Points and Information Systems are just two examples here where I would look to.

Also, I'll add that this sort of thing can certainly apply to other fields (The essay, Not all information wants to be free : the case study of "On our backs" / Tara Robertson, which appears in the book Applying library values to emerging technology discusses a case of an erotic print magazine that was digitized and how this new context being easily accessible was extremely problematic). But anyway I will note that this is something that "good" metadata can account for, in

terms of attaching rights or privileges to certain resources. But anyway, simply the idea that academia has a right to all of our data and content, and that it is beneficial to classify and categorize our knowledge and expose the entirety of our archives is one that many thinkers are currently pushing back against. At the conference that I dropped in on this weekend, this theme came up in a number of talks actually, ie. both posing the question of whether it was advantageous to expose the entirety of our archives and just thinking about the appropriate level of opacity,

[**CLICK**]

as well as how the classification of datasets could be used in ways that were extremely harmful to specific communities. Oh, and also how academia and certain disciplines have a history of exploiting certain communities and peoples in its quest for knowledge and profit. So, for me, this points to a question of where it is appropriate and beneficial to put our efforts and resources, and choosing what exactly we should be making discoverable and in what ways we are making things discoverable. I mean, again, this is not necessarily an argument against designing systems

that help our communities connect with the information in our collections, and I am, for the record, certainly a huge proponent of open access and open source technologies (partially for the ways that they can contribute to the sovereignty and quality of our metadata), but I think it is important for us to think about the power that metadata and knowledge discovery systems have, and that they intersect with people's bodies in very real and sometimes very damaging ways. So, to me, one thing that "good" metadata, and that good classification and discovery systems do, is to help us create worlds and realities that are beneficial to us all, whether by making transparent the processes and workings of the systems themselves, or by actively working towards not reinforcing and recreating structures that we would collectively agree to be, um, bad. But I would certainly look to our colleagues who have already done some work on this as it relates to Hawaiʻi.

[**CLICK**]

Maybe it is a good time to throw in the recognition that there are both real and artificially imposed constraints that libraries have to face, whether in terms of people or financial resources or space or whatever, and that oftentimes, we do not have the time or energy to put in the work to explore these questions and to try to implement the systems that would be best for our communities as we imagine them. And I think it is important that we can acknowledge and be critical of past practices in a way that recognizes constraints and that does not place blame on folks who have probably been doing their best with the resources they have, but yet enable us to move forward and possibly change the way that we do things in the future. So I guess this point I wanted to bring up, is that while I think it is good practice to imagine and design for our ideal systems and to thoroughly interrogate what that means, I think it is important to recognize the realities that we swim in, and that sometimes we make choices that might be less than ideal, and that is okay, but also that we should be clear and transparent about these choices.

[**CLICK**]

In one sense, I don't think improving the library's metadata to improve discoverability would necessarily be that hard, assuming we had people whose job it was to actually focus on that. Like, in a certain sense, we can look at it as a puzzle to be solved, where we have certain constraints (again, some more real and some more imagined) and these limits that need to be worked with, and then go about solving that puzzle. But, I mean, I know that there is a history in this library, partially due to size, and partially due to the genealogies of the different departments and library structures, of difficulties in getting the various departments to communicate with each other, and move together in a common direction. And I am also aware of the sense in which some definitions of "good" metadata might make things easier or be correct for one group or department, but make things more difficult for another group. Or how the production of "good" metadata might be in some ways unsustainable, and lead to good discoverability only in the short term, or perhaps might lead to unfinished projects that make

the overall state of the metadata "bad." However, I think an approach that takes the time to investigate past and current practices, and have in depth conversations with everyone involved could potentially lead to positive outcomes. This should probably include research and conversation with folks outside the library as well, to get a sense of how discoverable our different resources actually are. I mean, I am a big proponent of user testing (however informal) throughout design processes. I am a proponent of open ended talk story sessions and face to face communication (which some of you might know from how I operated in SciTech), also iterative feedback gathering, and hashing out the sort of theoretical and philosophical questions discussed earlier, and doing this at the start of projects. Um, and this is kind of why I did not really want to get too much into specifics on how "good" metadata will improve discoverability, because I strongly feel that the methods we use when problem solving are of prime importance to reaching the outcomes we want to reach, even if we don't know exactly what they will look like. Like, even though I've worked here on three separate occasions and gotten to

know many of the wonderful and colorful cogs of this library machine, and have emailed and discussed with some of you the ways in which the state of our metadata could stand improvement, I don't really have a firm grasp of the history of how metadata practices have evolved here to tell you exactly the ways in which "good" metadata will actually improve access to electronic resources.

[**CLICK**]

You know, even though I have looked at this poster presentation slide that came up as the second hit I think in a OneSearch search for good metadata. Which, just a cursory glance, seems to have some good ideas that I like. But yeah, I guess, no, anyway, let's look at an example of how good metadata can improve access to electronic resources.

[**CLICK**]

[**FOLLOW LINK**]

So assuming this works. This is the 'Uluʻulu Moving Image Archive site, where I used to work as a cataloger, and helped develop the metadata policies and procedures, some of which are still in use. Let's watch a

movie. Hopefully the sound will be loud enough. It was kind of quiet on my computer.

[**PLAY CLIP** Eddie Kamae introduces "Listen to the Forest"]

So, just, while we are here, let's look at some of the metadata. What metadata doesn't show up? A transcript could be useful and might actually exist in MAVIS, which forms the backend of the archival catalog. Let's follow the collection.

[**CLICK COLLECTION**]

[**CLICK SUBCOLLECTION**]

So, let's say you are watched that clip and you heard Eddie Kamae mention Pua Kanahele.

[**CLICK PAGE FOUR**]

[**PLAY CLIP** Interview with Kumu Hula Pualani Kanakaʻole-Kanahele at Waipiʻo tape 1]

So, first thank you Aunty Pua for that clear and concise explanation of food sovereignty in 1991. But, let's not that she starts off with a discussion of how proper communication and you might say informational practices can give you a firm grounding that will benefit you in whatever field you go into. But also, she

mentions photographs of loʻi in Waikīkī. Which then led me to think, oh, I wonder if I can find those or similar pictures. So, I went to UH Mānoa library website and searched for Waikiki taro photographs.

[**GOTO** http://manoa.hawaii.edu/library/]

[**SEARCH** waikiki taro photograph]

Oh, it says it's an image. Oh, it says it's available online.

[**FOLLOW LINK** Hawaiian Islands.

https://digital.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/collections/show/49]

Now, scrolling through, I didn't see anything. But when I searched all the digital image collections for waikiki taro, I got a few results.

[**SEARCH** waikiki taro]

Mention the metadata. Mention anonymous comment.

[**SEARCH** waikiki kalo]

[**SEARCH** waikīkī taro]

So again, is this an example of good metadata leading to discoverability? Yeah. Is there room for improvement? Yeah. Okay, back to the powerpoint.

[**CLICK**]

So, yeah, thinking about storytelling, and metadata as storytelling, I think is really valuable.

[**CLICK**]

Another place I looked when mulling over this topic, before I realized that our library colleagues have already published something that dealt explicitly with these themes, was works dealing with other forms of Hawaiian communication, namely storytelling and poetry. So, like the books Finding Meaning by Brandy MacDougall, which is about kaona and contemporary Hawaiian literature, and Voices of Fire by kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui, which is about Pele and Hiʻiaka literature. Um, yeah, anyway, I think this is a valuable place to look, because obviously in Hawaiʻi, stories, chants, poetry, songs, etc., were not simply entertainment or whatever, but primary ways in which knowledge was dispersed through the community, which is what we are talking about when we are talking about metadata and discovery tools. They are methods and technologies in which we disperse knowledge to the constituent parts of our community. And there are

a lot of bits in there that I feel could be invaluable jumping off points for thinking about these issues, whether relating to kaona connectivity, or moʻokūauhau or moʻo ʻōlelo. Anyway.

[**CLICK**]

Here's a bunch of words on a screen. We can get into some them in more detail in the Q&A if you want.

Oh, but getting back to MAVIS, which we used at ʻUluʻulu and was a very powerful and configurable integrated moving image archive system with lots and lots of fields, in which we captured a lot of metadata, and for which there was almost unlimited potential for adding more and more and more. So, and we can get into this, but even though I might argue that MAVIS was a little too much for our small archive, certainly when we started out, and perhaps led to some poor metadata choices, certainly in one sense you could say that the detailed and very meticulous metadata we created in MAVIS was "good" because it gave and gives us the potential to utilize this information in future

systems and projects in beautiful and unexpected ways. There is a sense where detailed and clean and exportable metadata is an inherent "good" because it gives us and future users the potential to design interesting discovery tools that maybe are currently out of reach. Some things I had in mind at the time, such as place names (a map-like discovery tool) or genealogical relationships between name records. There are ethical questions here, and a lot of cataloging to do, but I think there is the potential that comes from having detailed and thorough metadata attached to records, even if we are not sure how they will be utilized with our current discovery tools.

[**CLICK**]

I mean, obviously. Um, yeah.

[**CLICK**]

So, I guess I'll end with this Fanon quote that kind of drives my methodology when deciding the value of projects that I work on and the ways that I will invest

myself in these projects. And I'll say, basically, that what interests me the most with pretty much any undertaking is an approach that is inclusive and expands the knowledge base of the entire, in this instance, library and university and broader community, even if that might be unorthodox or at times risky in a sense. Not to say I am not interested in solving puzzles and tedious cleaning up of records within our current systems, and I think my previous experience has given me the skills to do that, and it is something I find enjoyable sometimes. But yeah, broadly speaking, I am interested in more than just plugging holes on a sinking ship, let's say. Not to call this library a sinking ship or anything, but I mean, um, I don't think it is too much of a stretch to posit that many of us have felt that way while doing our jobs. And ideally we would all have the space to do something we really were invested in, in a manner that we found enriching and rewarding for everyone.

[**CLICK**]

Um, anyway, these are just some of the things that have come up for me as I was ruminating on this topic of how good metadata could improve discoverability of the library's electronic resources and digital collections, and that I would ideally want kept in mind when approaching a project for improving metadata or designing or redesigning metadata policies or procedures.

[**CLICK**]

Here are some sources that I used I think. I didn't do the best job of citing. Sorry.

[**CLICK**]

Good metadata is exportable
[probably skip over; also mention exportability of MAVIS into XML]
So, something like LCSH might be useful in its interoperability with outside library systems or just in the breadth of its dataset, it might be bad if the categories it utilizes do not make sense to our

community. Discovery tools created with an imagined Hawaiʻi-based community at the forefront (while keeping in mind other potential users, obviously) might look different than a discovery tool created by a foreign corporation that is not designed with Hawaiʻi in mind at all, and for which Hawaiʻi is such a small segment of its user base that we have no power to influence future design decisions. So, some questions to keep in mind. Who are our discovery tools for? What are our current constraints? What are the possible future landscapes that we might find ourselves in? Which of these futures do we actually want to live in?

Good Metadata is Consistent
[probably skip over]
I mean, just to harp on LCSH. I spent a lot of time merging subject authority records at Hanahauʻoli, because of differences in how the subfields were input. Duplicate or extremely similar subject authority records are all over the UH catalog and I cannot imagine that there is consistency in how our records are cataloged, when so many LC headings are so

similar to each other. I thought of this a lot when starting from scratch at ʻUluʻulu (hardly any of our titles were previously cataloged), and the benefits of having a less complex set of subject headings that could be applied more consistently. Consistency is really hard for cataloging in general, but attempting to design consistency into metadata practices will often make things easier for the algorithms and databases that have to process the metadata, not to mention the catalogers of the future.

Good Metadata is Clean
[probably skip over]
I'll give one example here of my contract job for Shangri-La, when they were migrating their library catalog into their new integrated museum system. They used LOC classification, but the call numbers really needed to be cleaned up before they were imported. Extra spaces, capitalization, inconsistent use of periods, would all affect sorting and validation and how the records would be imported into the new system. With some systems, minor spelling mistakes,

inconsistent use of plurals, etc. can all affect what comes up in a search query.

Good Metadata is Cool

I mean, obviously. Um, yeah.

So, I guess I'll end with a Fanon quote that kind of drives my methodology when deciding the value of projects that I work on and the ways that I will invest myself in these projects. "..." and I'll say, basically, that what interests me the most with pretty much any undertaking is an approach that is inclusive and expands the knowledge base of the entire, in this instance, library and university and broader community, even if that might be unorthodox or at times risky in a sense. Not to say I am not interested in solving puzzles and tedious cleaning up of records within our current systems, and I think my previous experience has given me the skills to do that, and it is something I find enjoyable sometimes. But yeah, broadly speaking, I am interested in more than just plugging holes on a sinking ship, let's say. Not to call

this library a sinking ship or anything, but I mean, um, I don't think it is too much of a stretch to posit that many of us have felt that way while doing our jobs. And ideally we would all have the space to do something we really were invested in, in a manner that we found enriching and rewarding for everyone.

Um, anyway, these are just some of the things that have come up for me as I was ruminating on this topic of how good metadata could improve discoverability of the library's electronic resources and digital collections, and that I would ideally want kept in mind when approaching a project for improving metadata or designing or redesigning metadata policies or procedures.

Here are some sources that I used I think. I didn't do the best job of citing. Sorry.

list the panels
Abolition and Abundance
Finding Meaning
Voices of Fire

Kanaka Methodologies
Wretched of the Earth
Off Our Backs
Time is the thing our body moves through
tami t
metadata matters

While I did have earlier experiences with Horizon while at Hanahauʻoli Elementary School, and Voyager while at UH West Oʻahu, and dabbled throughout and since library school with software like Greenstone or Koha or the ILS I created for my quasi imaginary library system, the OJPL, MAVIS was my first really in-depth relationship with a fully developed integrated library or archival system. After a brief honeymoon at the MAVIS user group meeting in exotic Culpepper, Virginia, I would spend the next three years working with MAVIS to catalog and disperse the copious amounts of metadata that we collected at what is now the ʻUluʻulu Moving Image Archive. Which was, at times, a challenge. First, MAVIS was not designed for the sorts of materials we had in our collection, and the

very structure of how MAVIS organized resources made things difficult for an archive where the content that was on a videotape might not match or be clear from what was on the label, and where new content might start midway through one tape and end on another that also contained various other titles., and where we could not know what was on the tapes without actually digitizing them, since repeated playthrough would run the risk of damaging both the tapes and the machinery. So, right off the bat, we had to work to jam the metadata available to us into fields and structures that did not necessarily make sense for us. There would also later be a challenge of exporting the data, with our archival classifications and such, which were somewhat determined by MAVIS, but also by then-current professional-type archival standards, but anyway, communicating these classification systems to the external web development team that designed the archive's website could be frustrating and was probably never quite successful. That is, a website and OPAC was never developed that made full use of the sometimes very detailed metadata that we had in MAVIS. MAVIS was very complex and powerful in

terms of the information we could put inside. And one of the benefits was that it was run by a small company with a small number of users, and the people that designed and maintained the software were in direct communication with us and would release updates based directly on the needs of the users. But then again, the simple fact that MAVIS had soooo many fields might have encouraged us to utilize all of these fields, which, as a small staff of three, might have overwhelmed us a bit, and led us to designing procedures that might have been a bit convoluted and unnecessary, part of this due to the fact that we also utilized other systems, such as digitization hardware and software that created its own metadata that needed to be imported into MAVIS, and also that we only had a limited number of workstations that ran MAVIS, so some of the metadata recorded by our media specialist, for example, could not be input by them into MAVIS directly. Now, this is not to say all of the metadata we collected was "bad," but you could question its value in terms of the resources that went into its creation and the sustainability of the procedures we created. Also, I would add, in terms of

the interoperability of the metadata, and whether it all can be translated into a new archival cataloging system, which is something that might need to happen once the entire project stops being maintained and updated when the company that developed it ceases to exist. Anyway, you could argue our metadata was bad, due to the fact that the website developers contracted to design the website were unable to create an easy to maintain system of extracting the metadata from MAVIS into the website, or that the subject headings, say, at least in early implementations of the website, were parsed incorrectly, and did not always yield a list of videos that corresponded to the subject you had clicked on.

Finding Meaning

"anchors our place in the universe emphasizing our continuance as a people.
Means of connecting "histories of relationality that tell us who we were and who we are.

Moʻokūʻauhau are more than just a list of names...

Kaona is a practice of veiling and layering meaning as well as of finding meaning.

Kaona connectivity: teach [content], demonstrates relevance to our lives, provide models of behavior, challenge readers to integrate and apply ancestral knowledge.

Voices of Fire

discussion of an indigenous framework for book designed
talking about moʻolelo as a succession of words

weaving oral and written aesthetics.
"The publication of oral traditions preciptated…"

this list of ethno-poetic devices was interesting to me.

Stuff I haven't read or reread for this presentation includes Shavonn Matsuda's thesis, and a recent article on decolonizing knowledge organization systems.

It's Not Your Right To Know [play song]
Sorry that was the dance party portion of the talk. Anyway, I'm going to take this song a little out of context and apply this to academia in general and even the underlying purpose of this university, which I think is currently (perhaps always?) in flux and a site for struggle. I think there is a certain history of the university's function as very much an institution of extraction and settler-colonialism, and only more recently a claim to be both an indigenous serving institution and one that is grounded in indigenous values. Putting aside a perhaps widespread sentiment that the university might not be living up to this in practice, or even folks who are just flat out antagonistic to indigenous needs and values, I feel it is important to stress that I think it is uncontroversial to point out that academia itself, and furthering the objectives of all academic institutions, is not necessarily, and certainly has not always been in the past, a "good" in and of itself. When preparing for this presentation, and thinking about what is "good" metadata, I thought of what "good" metadata would

mean in the context of Hawaiʻi. And, disclaimer, while I am in no sense a Hawaiian Studies expert, and my connections to this place only started acquiring flesh some 14 or so years ago, my cursory familiarity with Hawaiian methodologies and knowledge acquisition practices has exposed me to the idea that some knowledge and intellectual content is not necessarily, how should we say, for everyone, or maybe more accurately, that there are specific methods for which one should go about acquiring certain knowledge or information. Just an example of what that might look like off the top of my head, I know in New Zealand Aotearoa there are certain protocols involved with accessing some archival materials that might involve different ʻiwi, or that a cultural expert, for example, would accompany certain films from the film archive when they were screened in different locations. Again, this is just to complicate our notion of "good" metadata and discoverability a bit, and an example of where my brain goes when thinking about these questions.

Also, I'll add that this sort of thing can certainly apply to other fields (I recall an article in book we received when I was in the SciTech department about a

newsletter that was released in a specific context being digitized and made accessible in ways that might be damaging to some of the folks that show up in the content of the newsletter (Off Our Backs?). But I will note that this is something that "good" metadata can account for, in terms of attaching rights or privileges to certain resources. But anyway, simply the idea that academia has a right to all of our data and content, and that it is beneficial to classify and categorize our knowledge and expose the entirety of our archives is one that many thinkers are currently pushing back against. At the American Studies Association conference that I dropped in on this weekend, which sorry, this is what happens when I engage with professional academic organization apparently, but anyway, this theme came up in a number of talks actually, ie. both posing the question of whether it was advantageous to expose the entirety of our archives and just thinking about the appropriate level of opacity.

as well as how the classification of datasets could be used in ways that were extremely harmful to specific

communities. Oh, and also how academia and certain disciplines have a history of exploiting certain communities and peoples in its quest for knowledge and profit. So, for me, this points to a question of where it is appropriate and beneficial to put our efforts and resources, and choosing what exactly we should be making discoverable and in what ways we are making things discoverable. I mean, again, this is not necessarily an argument against designing systems that help our communities connect with the information in our collections, and I am, for the record, certainly a huge proponent of open access and open source techonologies (partially for the ways that they can contribute to the sovereignty and quality of our metadata), but I think it is important for us to think about the power that metadata and knowledge discovery systems have, and that they intersect with people's bodies in very real and sometimes very damaging ways. So, to me, one thing that "good" metadata, and that good classification and discovery systems do, is to help us create worlds and realities that are beneficial to us all, whether by making transparent the processes and workings of the systems

themselves, or by not actively working towards not reinforcing and recreating structures that we would collectively agree to be, um, bad.