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On May 27, 2014, we launched the first report of the Copy Cataloguing Group (CCG). Since the last report, we have continued to respond to the evolution in the cataloguing world beyond and within our local environment. As a result of what we have learned, we present this progress report.

Our experiences over the past two years have taught us that future discovery needs will require different and evolving skillsets. We have been able to act upon some recommendations from the initial report. For example, CCG has taken part in conversations regarding course content with the program head and instructor of the Library and Information Technology Program at Saskatchewan Polytechnic. Conversely, we had to change our way of thinking about hybrid records, [aka Franken-records]. As an example of this, GMDs (general material designators), such as *video recording* or *electronic resource*, have been replaced with coding in other fields rather than in the title field. We have realized that hybrid records need to exist because they bridge the gap between AACR2 and RDA.

As we balance everyday jobs with continuous learning needs, we have come to accept that current cataloguing practice involves guidelines, rather than rigid rules. These guidelines, the tools we use, the environment in which we work, and the new opportunities afforded by changing perspectives are also continually evolving. While change remains a constant, our goal and purpose remains the same. The role of cataloguing today, as in the past, is to describe resources to make them as discoverable as possible.

Since the last report, our membership has changed. However, communication skills developed over the past years have allowed us to continue building on the strength of our teamwork. In addition to our primary purpose of enhancing cataloguing skills, we have found that as a team and as individuals we have developed new leadership, problem-solving, and technical skills. Through our regularly scheduled and well-documented meetings, frequent email updates, intensive training sessions, timely discussions and knowledge-sharing, we have become more cohesive and productive. As we have combined our strengths, learned from our different backgrounds, and expanded our understanding of the work we do within our unit and how it impacts on the library, we have opened up silos and developed the ability to step into each other’s shoes as needed.

CCG has learned that we need to be agile in the current cataloguing environment. Not only does the current cataloguing standard, Resource Description and Access (RDA), continually change, but the theoretical models that encompass the cataloguing standards are also evolving. What we previously knew as the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) has now branched off into two models: FRBR-LRM and FRBRoo. Also, because guidelines are always changing, we depend heavily on the use of MARC Standards and having access to the RDA Toolkit. The challenge we face on a daily basis is that what we do today may not be accepted as best practice tomorrow.

It is challenging working with changing guidelines and learning to apply cataloguer’s judgement – especially when there is not always consensus amongst experts in the field of cataloguing. Our group has been very fortunate to be able to rely on our metadata librarian for training as we’ve moved forward.

Examples of training provided by Donna Frederick our Metadata Librarian:

* Group training on creation of RDA bibliographic records for:
  + Music cassette tapes
  + Music vinyl records
  + DVDs
  + Monographs
* Sub Group training on creation of RDA bibliographic records for:
  + Serials
  + Integrating Resources
  + Theses
* Ongoing updates on changes to RDA, including languages other than English

We are increasingly aware that changes in cataloguing impact other areas of the library. Our environment has become more global, so we need to adhere to international standards and guidelines as we pay more attention to the bigger picture and how our discovery records will work in the future. RDA was developed with the purpose of making cataloguing more flexible in the way we create bibliographic records, using guidelines and applying cataloguer’s judgement rather than relying on the strict rules of AACR2. The shift to the use of linked data and BIBFRAME requires a new awareness of how we will need to migrate our local data out of bibliographic records which results in less flexibility in terms of what we can include in a bibliographic record (local notes, local series, holdings information, and all local fields). Our first positive action to preserve local data has been to include local call numbers in individual item records. We know that the ways discovery records are obtained and linked to local acquisition and holdings records are going to change. Moving forward, we must continue to reflect on and analyze the local data that is in our bibliographic records, in an effort to preserve this information when we migrate to a new system.

In the future, we will also need to be prepared for the post-MARC metadata model known as BIBFRAME. In order for the metadata in our MARC records to migrate as seamlessly as possible to this new metadata framework, it is imperative that we follow international standards and guidelines as closely as possible. The transition from MARC to BIBFRAME is one of the most important changes to impact the library world because of how it will make metadata in library catalogues available to a much larger audience outside the library community. This is because BIBFRAME is designed to use linked data principles, such as URIs (Uniform Resource Identifiers), Authority control data, and the RDF (Resource Description Framework) model. Currently when we catalogue resources, our goal is to make our library’s resources discoverable by our users. But what if our “users” are located on the other side of the world and are not intentionally trying to access our library’s catalogue and perhaps do not even know about the existence of the University of Saskatchewan? What if Google, so often considered competition for today’s library, is actually a part of the solution? Our library’s resources could potentially become searchable and discoverable via a simple Google search if we are able to successfully transition to the use of linked data and BIBFRAME. Think about the possibilities for serendipitous discovery of our library’s resources.

BIBFRAME has a timeline of 2 to 5 years in the future, and the current move to cloud based record delivery requires us to analyze how MARC fields have been configured in our existing ILS to avoid duplication of records.

While the future is murky and we don’t have a crystal ball, CCG must continue to communicate with the library as a whole. Every unit and branch in the library has a role to play, as we work towards our common goal of resource discovery. We are in the early stages of learning about linked data, and we know that there are a number of “early adopter” libraries upon which we could piggyback, as we learn from their mistakes and successes.

Keeping our libraries current and relevant in the digital age is about creating a sense of place, providing beneficial spaces and services, and making our collections discoverable by a wider audience. As well as focusing on bringing people to the library, we need to find ways of bringing the library to the people.
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