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RDA Word Association Game

The thing that worries/concerns/stresses me out most about RDA implementation is:

- ILS issues
- Don’t know where to start
- Small library – few resources
- I’ll be behind
- Loss of GMD
- Librarians fear this change
- Overwhelmed
- Steep learning curve
- What is to come?
- Split catalog
- Looking Ahead

Discussion Points

- RDA @ UChicago
- Preparing Your Staff: Training Resources
- Preparing Your ILS System
- Looking Ahead
RDA @ UChicago

UChicago Cataloging Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Original Catalogers</th>
<th>Support Staff/Copy Catalogers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services (Acq/Cat/DBM)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12 + 15 ACQ assistants</td>
<td>7.5 FTE for ACQ students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia Collection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Cataloging Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Original Cataloging</th>
<th>Copy Cataloging</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Technical Services</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>94,095</td>
<td>107,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5,128</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia Collection</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>9,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS for FY2012</td>
<td>14,540</td>
<td>108,119</td>
<td>122,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acquisitions Cataloging Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Cataloging from OCLC copy</td>
<td>21,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casalini Rapid Cataloging</td>
<td>2,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBP Rapid Cataloging</td>
<td>26,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RAPID CATALOGING ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,866</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added copies</td>
<td>2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CATALOGING ACTIVITY IN ACQUISITIONS IN FY2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,611</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC’s Cataloging ‘Characteristics’

- Commitment to Program for Cooperative Cataloging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIBCO</th>
<th>NACO</th>
<th>Series NACO</th>
<th>CONSER</th>
<th>Saco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>6,941</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Clear distinction in roles and responsibilities: original catalogers do original; copy catalogers do copy
- Heavily focused on exposing special, rare, and hidden collections
- No “managed backlogs” of incoming acquisitions

UChicago’s RDA Training

- Pre-test RDA training in summer 2010 – included all original and copy cataloging staff. Used LC training materials exclusively
- Post-test BIBCO and NACO “refresher” in February 2011; instituted an internal “peer review” process
- Regular monthly meetings of original catalogers to discuss RDA issues
- June 2012: formal NACO RDA training via PCC
- July 2012: began reviewing other NACO institutions’ RDA authorities
- Winter 2012/13: began reviewing other BIBCO institutions’ RDA bibliographic records
Cumulative Total of UChicago's RDA Bibliographic Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original records</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>8,001</td>
<td>11,379</td>
<td>14,219</td>
<td>15,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from AACR2 to RDA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported RDA copy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>7,243</td>
<td>10,975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>10,616</td>
<td>12,698</td>
<td>18,998</td>
<td>25,392</td>
<td>30,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Total of UChicago's RDA Authority Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original NACO records</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>7,207</td>
<td>8,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported NACO records</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>33,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>42,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building a Culture of Assessment for Metadata

- For RDA records, potential user testing of:
  - Reproductions
  - Content, Media and Carrier Types & their integration into facets
  - RDA data for music resources
  - Relationships between RDA data and our faceted catalog interface
- Reciprocal learning for catalogers and assessment colleagues
- Be cognizant of whether we are testing RDA, or RDA in MARC, or local systems configuration
Next Steps for UChicago

- Re-think impact on copy cataloging
- Build an assessment program for RDA data
- Evaluate impact on authorities processing and DBM generally
- Evaluate impact on systems design for Kuali-OLE (http://www.kuali.org/ole)
- Continuing learning about Semantic Web, linked data, alternatives to MARC Formats

Management ‘Master Plan’

- System Management: ILS and OPAC configuration
- Staff Management: Training and review, Ongoing continuing education
- Workflow Management: RDA’s impact on workflows in Acquisitions & Cataloging
- Data Management: RDA’s impact on local policies, procedures, documentation

System Management: Preparing Your ILS
MARC Bibliographic records are coded:
- Leader/18 (Desc) = “i” for ISBD
- 040 $a CGU $c CGU $e rda

MARC Authority records are coded:
- 008/10 (Desc) = “z” for Other
- 040 $a CGU $b eng $c CGU $e rda

New Bibliographic fields to replace GMD:
- 336 – Content Type
- 337 – Media Type
- 338 – Carrier Type

New Bibliographic and Authority subfield defined to express relationships:
Si defined in Bibliographic 7XX and 76X-78X and in Authority 4XX and 5XX for relationships between resources

New MARC Authority fields for name attributes:
- 046 – Special Coded Dates
- 368 – Other Attributes of Person or Corporate Body
- 370 – Associated Place
- 371 – Address
- 372 – Field of Activity
- 373 – Affiliation
- 374 – Occupation
- 375 – Gender
- 376 – Family Information
- 377 – Associated Language
- 378 – Fuller Form of Name (under discussion)
RDA in MARC

- **New MARC Authority and Bibliographic fields for work and expression attributes:**
  - 046 - Special Coded Dates (new subfields only)
  - 336 - Content Type
  - 377 - Associated Language
  - 380 - Form of Work
  - 381 - Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression
  - 382 - Medium of Performance
  - 383 - Numeric Designation of Musical Work
  - 384 - Key

Library of Congress, RDA in MARC,
http://www.loc.gov/marc/RDAinMARC.html

Punctuation in RDA Records

“Below is a link to the cheat-sheet I created summarizing what end-of-field punctuation looks like in RDA records, limited to the 245 through 5xx fields. It’s based on LC/PCC/MARC practice and colored by the current edition of the ISBD.

http://goo.gl/p0pWp”

-- Posted to RDA-L, March 01/13 by Mark K. Ehler, Minitex

GMD “replaced” by 3 new elements

- **Content type (MARC 336)**
  - performed music
  - spoken word
  - still image
  - text

- **Media type (MARC 337)**
  - audio
  - computer
  - microform
  - unmediated

- **Carrier type (MARC 338)**
  - computer disc
  - microfilm reel
  - online resource
  - volume
When discussing the new fields for content, media, and carrier, trainers should stress that the terms used in these fields are meant for machine manipulation rather than human eyes and that the MARC 33X fields do not need to be displayed in the user interface; they could be replaced by icons or other terms.

**264 - Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture, and Copyright Notice**

- **First Indicator**: Items of content: 4 - Not applicable; No information provided; Default 1 - Introducing 2 - Continuing
- **Second Indicator**: Processing Family: 0 - Production 1 - Publication 2 - Distribution 3 - Manufacture 4 - Copyright notice line

**Field Codes**:
- $a - Place of production, publication, distribution, manufacture ($X)
- $b - Date of production, publication, distribution, manufacture ($X)
- $d - Date of production, publication, distribution, manufacture, or copyright notice ($X)
- $s - Manifestation specified ($N)
- $t - License ($X)
- $u - Field link and sequence number ($X)


**Staff Management: Training Resources**
Do you feel like this?

- A recent question posted on RDA-L:

  If I
  (a) need to cross-train from AACR2 to RDA, initially for monographs
  (b) I have no institutional financial support
  (c) I can’t afford training prices that I see on the web

  what can I do? I’m not asking this to be negative or critical, which it might sound, but just to find a way of getting cross-trained without spending a lot of money. I can see a few books, but even they are more than I want to spend since the money would have to come out of my own pocket.

Impact on Acquisitions & Copy Cataloging

- Impact of “fast cat”/”rapid cat” processes?
- “Translate” RDA into copy cataloging procedures?

Impact on Copy Cataloging

- Impact on copy cataloging documentation and training in the short and long term
  - Accept copy as-is? All of the time? Some of the time?
  - Correct poor RDA copy (e.g., coded RDA but missing core elements)?
  - Assess appropriate levels of record hybridization
  - RDA-ify existing AACR2 records?
  - All of the above?
### Copy Cataloging Resources

  - This appendix provides checklists to be used by LC’s RDA-trained copy catalogers and technicians to:
    1. identify when it is appropriate to convert an imported AACR2 record to RDA;
    2. recognize common differences between AACR2 and RDA that should be checked when importing records that can be converted to RDA;
    3. recognize LC practices, including “LC core” elements, that should be addressed when importing records that are already RDA or will be converted to RDA;
    4. recognize situations where a cataloging technician may need to consult with an RDA cataloger regarding authority records or authorized access points.

(DCM is available in Cataloger’s Desktop)

### Original Cataloging Resources

- LC RDA Core Elements: [http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/core_elements.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/core_elements.pdf)
- Program for Cooperative Cataloging
  - PCC Catalogers Workshop: [http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/](http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/)

### PCC Catalogers Learning Workshop

- Available at: [http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/](http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/)
- Provides a wealth of training and workshop materials on a variety of cataloging topics
  - PCC RDA Training Materials
  - Cataloging Skills (subject analysis, classification, series authorities)
  - Digital Library Environment (digital library development, metadata standards)
  - Continuing Resources (serials cataloging)
PCC RDA Training Materials:
http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/RDA%20training%20materials/index.html
- PCC RDA Training Materials
- LC RDA Training Materials
- RDA Toolkit Training
- RDA Record Examples
- FRBR Training Resources

PCC Standing Committee on Training (SCT) RDA Training Materials Task Group:
- Six categories of vetted RDA Training Materials:
  - General Documentation
  - Theoretic Foundations (including FRBR and FRAD)
  - Introduction to RDA Toolkit
  - RDA for General Cataloging
  - RDA for Special Formats
  - RDA and Authority Records

ALCTS RDA YouTube Channel
http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1AAFB573158DC4A1
Cataloger’s judgment is omnipresent in RDA – how much do you want to mandate locally?

Consider local policies on (or at least discussion of):
- Use of relationship designators
- Multiple 33X data in bibs (record in single or multiple fields?)
- 264 applications
  - 37X fields in authority records (when to populate the optional elements?)

Authority control processing
- Backstage Library Works: http://ac.bslw.com/community/blog/tag/rda/
- LTI statement on RDA: http://www.authoritycontrol.com/ltnews

Purchased MARC records
- Outsourced cataloging
Having not been a part of the effort to create MARC those many decades ago, I cannot imagine what conditions fostered its birth. But in my ignorance I imagine that the opportunities created by computers inspired Henriette Avram and company to rise to the challenge of recreating our professional infrastructure in a revolutionary and farsighted way. We would do well to look to our past for the inspiration we need to create a future that our descendants will look upon with similar amazement.”


Limitations of Present Model

- RDA test highlighted need to move out of MARC

“Most [testers] felt any benefits of RDA would be largely unrealized in a MARC environment. MARC may hinder the separation of elements and ability to use URIs in a linked data environment.”


- Limitations of MARC for RDA:
  - Difficult to express relationships in an actionable way
  - Difficult to record discrete data discretely – RDA is specific; MARC is ambiguous
RDA Precision

- precise data elements
- each element is distinct and defined for one particular type of data

Separate element for each type of data

Illustrative content
Encoding format
Production method
Sound content
Applied material
Base material
Reduction ratio

Modified from Chris Oliver, RDA: Are we ready to implement? NOTSL 2012
Christopher Cronin © 2013

AACR2 and MARC

- information embedded in “other physical details” (or a non-specific note)

MARC 300 $b: Other physical details

Illustrative content
Encoding format
Production method
Sound content
Applied material
Base material
Reduction ratio

Modified from Chris Oliver, RDA: Are we ready to implement? NOTSL 2012
Christopher Cronin © 2013

RDA Controlled Vocabulary

- Controlled vocabulary recommended for many elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encoding format</th>
<th>DAISY, MP3, Access, XML, JPEG, TIFF, CAD, PDF, Blu-Ray, VCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production material</td>
<td>blueline, blueprint, engraving, etching, lithograph, photocopy, photoengraving, woodcut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base material</td>
<td>bristol board, canvas, cardboard, ceramic, glass, leather, paper, parchment, vellum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified from Chris Oliver, RDA: Are we ready to implement? NOTSL 2012
Christopher Cronin © 2013
"By descriptive enrichment I mean a set of procedures, human, machine, and combined, by which we capture descriptive information about an item or collection and continuously and iteratively enhance it. Perhaps an even more important distinction from past practice is that this process of continuously and iteratively enhancing the data should include not just professional librarians but also library users.” – Roy Tennant, 21st Century Description and Access
Structured data on the Web, where we:

1. Use URIs to denote things.
2. Use HTTP URIs so that these things can be referred to and looked up (“dereferenced”) by people and user agents.
3. Provide useful information about the thing when its URI is dereferenced, leveraging standards such as RDF, SPARQL.
4. Include links to other related things (using their URIs) when publishing data on the Web.

“Tim Berners-Lee, Design Issues: Linked Data
http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData

I’ll refer to the steps above as rules, but they are expectations of behavior. Breaking them does not destroy anything, but misses an opportunity to make data interconnected. This in turn limits the ways it can later be reused in unexpected ways. It is the unexpected re-use of information which is the value added by the web.”

Tim Berners-Lee, Design Issues: Linked Data
http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData

“provides a common framework that allows data to be shared and reused across application, enterprise, and community boundaries.”

Note: it’s about data, not documents or records

W3C Semantic Web FAQ
http://www.w3.org/RDF/FAQ
In the beginning ...

Lee, T. B.
Cataloguing has a future. - Audio disc (Spoken word). - Donated by the author.
1. Metadata

... the catalogue card

Our NEW task at hand

Task: To publish local structured metadata as global linked data in the Semantic Web

So that users inside the local environment can benefit from data/information from outside

And users outside the local environment can benefit from data/information from inside

Resource Description Framework (RDF)

- Resource Description Framework (RDF) = a graph-based data model for describing things
  - the subject denotes the resource
  - the predicate denotes traits or aspects of the resource and expresses a relationship between the subject and the object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>has author</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguing has a future</td>
<td>has subject</td>
<td>Metadata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of MARC for Linked Data

- MARC was created to print catalog cards, then used to display those cards in OPACs
- ILSs = relational databases = CLOSED
- MARC is used exclusively by libraries – no other industry shares our data format
- Every statement in MARC relies on the entire record for context and meaning.
  - None of the statements in a MARC record (i.e., its individual fields and subfields) can stand on their own.

http://xkcd.com/927/
“BIBFRAME” = Bibliographic Framework Initiative
- May 2011 – Initiative launched by Library of Congress
- October 2011 – LC publishes general plan
- May 2012 – Zepheira hired to do the data modeling
- November 2012 – LC publishes primer document, “Bibliographic Framework as a Web of Data: Linked Data Model and Supporting Services"

The Initiative aims to re-envision and, in the long run, implement a new bibliographic environment for libraries that makes “the network” central and makes interconnectedness commonplace.

The BIBFRAME model will be the foundation for the future of bibliographic description that happens on, in, and as part of the web and the networked world we live in.

It will realize these objectives in several ways:
1. Differentiate clearly between conceptual content and its physical manifestation(s) (e.g., works and instances)
2. Focus on unambiguously identifying information entities (e.g., authorities)
3. Leverage and expose relationships between and among entities

Consists of 4 main classes:
- **Work**
  - Resource reflecting the conceptual essence of the cataloging item
- **Instance**
  - Resource reflecting an individual, material embodiment of the Work
- **Authority**
  - Resource reflecting key authority concepts that have defined relationships reflected in the Work and Instance. Examples: people, places, subjects/topics, organizations.
- **Annotation**
  - Resources that “decorate” other BIBFRAME resources with additional information. Examples: holdings data, cover art images; reviews.
BIBFRAME

But instead of looking like this…

Or like this…

Christopher Cronin © 2013

Erin Stalberg, The Best Thing About the Future Is That It Comes Only One Day at A Time
...the metadata will look like this...

```xml
<!-- Work --
<resource id = "https://bibframe/work/1030-expect">
<titleStatement>Final report / IFLA study group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) as approved by the Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing</titleStatement>
<creator resource = "https://bibframe/auth/orp/ifla"/>
<subject resource = "https://bibframe/auth/topic/cataloging"/>
<subject resource = "https://bibframe/auth/topic/bibliography"/>
</resource>
</instance>
`
Your role in all of this...

Next Steps for You?
1. Configure your ILS – backend and public displays
2. Understand your local training needs, and…
3. Select from existing trusted training resources
4. Put what you learn to the test – apply it!
5. Institute a peer-review process for your records, either within your institution or across a cooperative.
6. Decide which policies you need to develop (or not develop!)

Above all, commit to professional development
- Follow LC-lead effort to transition out of MARC
- Semantic Web and linked data

Use existing training materials for RDA:
- LC materials: [http://www.loc.gov/aba/rdacat](http://www.loc.gov/aba/rdacat)
- LC/PCC Catalogers Workshop: [http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/](http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/)
Cataloging in Transition = Catalogers in Transition

Other Useful Resources

- Adam Schiff, Changes from AACR2 to RDA: A Comparison of Examples, http://faculty.washington.edu/aschiff/

Thank you!

Christopher Cronin

croninc@uchicago.edu