Those of us who don’t work in academic institutions might find repositories a bit of an unknown entity. In this issue we hope to solve your dilemma – we give you everything you always wanted to know about repositories but were afraid to ask. We start with articles by Gareth Johnson and Jackie Wickham that provide some background information, and follow up with more personal articles from a variety of practitioners that give a flavour of what it’s like managing a repository, dealing with classification problems, and moving from cataloguing into repository management. We hope these will answer most of your questions. Finally, we include a review of a seminar and a book review.
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There are moments when the UK Council of Research Repositories (UKCoRR) seems to be the best kept secret in Britain. UKCoRR was founded as one of the outputs from the JISC Funded SHERPA Plus project run by the University of Nottingham in 2007. The purpose was to support the then nascent repository manager and staff community who lacked a central organisation that would offer them a collective voice. It was founded and continues to operate as a closed community. This was in response to the fact that the pre-existing open access community was frequently dominated by non-practitioner voices that had an historical tendency to dominate conversations, even on occasion treating questions of practical repository management as an irrelevancy.

Membership

To become and remain a member of UKCoRR, individuals need to be currently working as a repository practitioner, administrator or manager. The governing Committee are responsible for applying this ruling, and on occasion for considering membership applications from those outside the strict definition of these criteria. Membership of UKCoRR centres on the JISCMAIL UKCoRR-Discussion list and is currently in excess of 260 members.

UKCoRR’s email group is a safe harbour and supporting community, run under Chatham House rules where no question or comment is regarded as an irrelevancy. For members the facility to have their issues discussed in confidence by a large gated community of like-minded individuals has often been noted as a particular strength of UKCoRR.

Membership of UKCoRR has always been cost neutral, noted as another key organisational USP for the membership. For the Committee it can be seen as somewhat of a boon and a blessing. Free of funding management and audit requirements, the Committee are able to devote all available time to fulfilling the purposes for which UKCoRR was founded. Conversely, lacking funds means that the financial backing for member events or activities is entirely down to the grace and favour of hosting venue or sponsors. Thanks to a number of generous hosts these have been successfully run on a number of occasions at no cost to delegates attending or UKCoRR itself.

Governance

In part due to the lack of funding, UKCoRR is often referenced as an example of a light-weight, flexible and adaptable 21st Century organisation 2.0 entity. In part, and in recognition for the funding free achievements of UKCoRR over the years, it was the recipient of the 2011 UKeig Jason Farradane Award.

UKCoRR is managed and advanced by an executive Committee, currently comprised of five officers with identified responsibilities. The lack of funding limits the ability of the Committee to meet face to face to at most once or twice a year. However, regular monthly telcons are held at the Chair’s instigation to ensure that progress and activities continue, as well as frequent and active electronic communication to deal with most interim matters.
At this time of writing the Governance is undergoing a period of mild change, to allow for enhancements to the operational efficiency of the organisation and Committee alike. This need in part emerged from the membership survey of 2011, and was followed up at events and in discussions on and around the membership distribution list.

One of the longest running, and perhaps slightly trivial, debates during the formative years of the organisation was the correct pronunciation of the acronym – UK-Core or U-Core. In recent years the Committee has standardised on UK-Core, to stress the UK wide nature and activity of the group.

**Collective Voice**

As well as membership meetings UKCoRR provides a collective, unified and independent voice to stakeholders in scholarly communications, and from stakeholders back to the membership. There are also regular requests from researchers working in the field of scholarly communication to canvass the opinions and insight of the UKCoRR membership; which is negotiated and facilitated as appropriate by the Committee.

Given their support for the open access agenda in the UK there has been a frequent interface with the JISC and many of their related programmes and projects. Committee members also sit on some of the committees and steering groups for these projects such as [UK Repository Net+](#). There is also interaction both formal and informal with other organisations including EThOS, Jorum, SCONUL and to a limited degree elements of CILIP as well. In this way the Committee helps assure that outputs, activities and services from these bodies will more closely meet the practical needs of the repository worker community.

One of the closest relationships UKCoRR has enjoyed is with the Research Support Project (RSP), itself a successor to the SHERPA-Plus project. At the time of writing after over half a decade of work providing a funded extensive training and awareness programme the future of the RSP is currently unclear. Given the lack of funding that UKCoRR runs on there is no possibility of the organisation taking on the entirety of RSP’s portfolio of activity for the UK repository community. However, UKCoRR is already considering the role it can play in this new community landscape in supporting its members’ needs.

**Community Activity**

While much of UKCoRR is a closed community, given the open access nature of most members’ jobs there is a willingness to share experience, challenge assumptions or simply engage with the wider community in a public forum. To this end, the organisation maintains a blog on which the Committee and occasionally invited guest authors post. Public statements of position from UKCoRR, such as opposition to the US Research Works Act or issues of concern over the RCUK’s open access policy proposals appear here. UKCoRR also conducts infrequent but valuable practitioner research into areas as diverse as electronic theses management and repository metrics.

Part of raising the concerns of the membership with the broader stakeholder community requires that UKCoRR itself becomes more recognised outside repository circles. To this end, in the past year it has engaged on an increasing advocacy and marketing strategy, approaching organisations and individuals perhaps on the periphery of the repository managers world but never-the-less ones with whom collaboration or discussion would prove profitable to the organisation and membership alike. As a result it has also entered into a
memorandum of understanding with Japan’s **Digital Repository Federation** (DRF),\(^{12}\) and has explored relationships with the **Coalition of Open Access Repositories** (CORE)\(^{13}\).

**Future**

The world of scholarly communications and open access continues to evolve and as such repository workers will continue to require support and representation from a professional organisation dedicated to their needs. Planned developments to UKCoRR’s governance and Committee structure coming into effect in 2013 will help the organisation to continue to meet the challenge of supporting our members’ working lives, professional development needs and exchange of experience.
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The Repositories Support Project is funded by JISC to support the development of research repositories in the UK. It began in September 2006 and has contributed to building repository capacity, knowledge and skills within UK higher education institutions. Through providing guidance and advice it benefits the whole of the UK sector resulting in the wider take-up and development of institutional repositories in HEIs.

The ongoing aim of the project is to progress the vision of a deployed network of interoperable repositories for academic papers, learning materials and research data across the UK. Whilst fulfilling the business requirements of HEIs to manage their assets, showcase research outputs, and share learning materials, such a network of populated repositories is a major step forward in the provision of open access materials.

The UK has been a real success story thanks to the investment provided through JISC¹ and by higher education institutions themselves. There are now 208 UK repositories registered in OpenDOAR², 9.5% of worldwide registrations.

Over the last few years institutional repositories have become well established and ubiquitous but they face two major challenges. The first is to encourage and increase the amount of full text (most repositories accept metadata only records as well as those with a full text attachment). The second is to ensure that the repository is integrated with other university systems, especially research information systems, and there is some anecdotal evidence that higher levels of integration lead to an increase in the number of full text deposits in the repository.

Last year, the RSP published the Embedding Guide which aims to support repository staff and help them meet these challenges. This website is a practical guide to embedding the repositories into institutional processes, systems and culture. Research repositories in higher education need to demonstrate value to their institutions and researchers. This means a close alignment with the institution’s strategic aims and the provision of services which help researchers with their own day-to-day work. The repository can help support the institution in, for example, reporting for the Research Excellence Framework, promoting the university as a research leader and increasing engagement with businesses and the community. The guide has collated the learning and experience of previous projects and activity in the UK. It includes video interviews with key people and a self-assessment tool which provides an “embedded score”. This can also be a useful catalyst for beginning discussion on how to integrate the repository and a vehicle for engaging those who need to be involved in planning and implementation.

Looking through the guide and self-assessment tool, it is evident that the U.K. has developed a solid infrastructure surrounding institutional repositories both within and between institutions; ...... As a whole, the Embedding Repositories guide and self-assessment tool is an excellent starting point for any repository wanting to take its services to the next level.”³
This recent development builds on the RSP’s established provision of practical and timely support to the repository community through its training events, outreach programme, website information and helpdesk. During the course of the project, the majority of UK higher education institutions have received support in one or more of these ways.

The highest profile activity is the events programme. Some statistics: the RSP has organised 40 events (including seven residential schools), with 1,322 delegates from 229 organisations. Events are designed to support staff at all levels. For technicians, workshops on DSpace and Eprints have been provided; these are the two big open source software packages in use in the UK. Advocacy forms a large part of the work of those employed in repositories and therefore skills training to support this has featured prominently in the programme – this has included techniques for effective promotion and an opportunity to share experience with staff in other institutions. For managers, there is a more strategic focus. For example, at the Winter School in February 2011, the programme included the topic of integrating the repository in the institution at a number of levels including policies, systems and the culture. It had a particular emphasis on research management systems and processes – it included an afternoon looking at case studies at a number of institutions. The feedback from participants is really positive – overall 98% of respondents have rated our events as Very good or Good. The following comment exemplifies this:

“This has to have been one of the best work-related courses I’ve attended. Not only do I feel that I have taken on board an enormous amount of information that is directly relevant to my job - and intellectually stimulating to boot - but I feel I have made contact with a supportive network of colleagues. All this, perfectly organised, and a faultless, fabulous environment, too. Outstanding. Thank you!”

A recent development has been the introduction of webinars using Adobe Connect. This has proved extremely successful and meets the needs of the community:

“Great format. Really liked being able to attend a relevant awareness session from the comfort of my desk! Much better than travelling miles. I liked the way the session was set up with questions & answers allowed at the end.”

Two webinars were delivered by Professor Charles Oppenheim on copyright issues with 58 and 72 attendees respectively and a third was presented by Scott Lapinski on “Advocacy on implementing funders’ mandates”
with 35 attendees. More are planned for June and July; two will feature case studies from UK institutions on promoting their repositories and a third on using bibliometrics to demonstrate the importance of the institution’s research. An additional advantage of the webinars is that they are recorded and made available as a resource for those who could not attend.

Consultancy visits provide individually tailored advice and support – 90 since the beginning of the project. The flavour of these can range from basic advice on setting up a repository through to a more topical approach with an established repository – for example reviewing an advocacy strategy or looking at workflows.

The helpdesk, telephone and e-mail, is available to answer individual queries and a Buddy Scheme puts people in touch with colleagues who may be able to offer advice and assistance, often someone who is in a similar position – perhaps in terms of repository development or geographical locality.

People can also consult the RSP website which has a wealth of information about setting up and developing repositories. This includes a detailed comparison of software providers which is very useful to those setting up. There is a wide range of briefing papers, which are succinct guides to the main areas of repository development, and a blog on topical issues. Details of all events are publicised on the website and the presentations archived as ongoing reference material. This is well-used with over 25,000 visitors in the last year, mostly from the UK but also across the world – from 140 countries. There is a community wiki containing detailed information about individual research repositories. The content is based on the questions asked by repository staff – for example, who provides a fully mediated deposit on behalf of academics? What is the % of full text in repositories? It answers those questions and each institution is able to edit their entry to keep it current.

The traditional view of repositories is that they are mainly populated with research articles, and textual material does form the majority of item types in repositories, However, there have been a number of projects and initiatives to develop repository software to accommodate and display non-text materials such as those produced in creative arts institutions and departments. These researchers are often very keen to deposit their work as long as it is presented on the web in a high quality and professional way. The JISC funded KULTUR project and spin offs such as KULTIVATE have taken repositories to new levels improving the appearance and metadata associated with such objects. The University of the Arts, London and University of the Creative Arts are good examples. The RSP website has a section which collates information and resources on this topic.
In the latter half of the project, the RSP has made extensive use of social media to publicise its activities and enhance the website. The blog and Twitter channel are linked so that all blog posts are tweeted. Twitter is also used to promote events. News items, reports, and press releases on the topic of open access are curated daily using Scoop.it! and displayed on the home page.

There are some examples, although not many, of similar support services in other countries. One of these is Japan and in January this year, Jackie Wickham, RSP team member, was invited to speak at a meeting of the Digital Repository Federation at Hokkaido University. This is described in detail on the RSP blog. This resulted in an agreement between the UK (RSP and the United Kingdom Council of Repositories) and Japan (DRF) committing the organisations to sharing experience and expertise and maximising opportunities for joint exchanges.

For further information about the RSP contact Jackie Wickham and Nancy Pontika at support@rsp.ac.uk or visit the website at www.rsp.ac.uk.
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Background

About ten years ago there were very few institutional repositories for the creative and applied arts. UCA Research Online http://www.research.ucreative.ac.uk was a direct outcome of a JISC funded project called Kultur which developed ‘a transferable model for an institutional repository for the creative arts.’ (Kultur, 2012)

The project partners were the University of Southampton, University of the Arts London, University for the Creative Arts and the Visual Arts Data Service, with Leiden University as an associate partner.

Two of the outputs of the Kultur project concerned metadata, quoted in full below.

‘2. A transferable model of an uber repository based on providing flexibility in matching metadata and indexing to discipline needs.

4. A metadata, preservation and access framework as an exemplar for managing material in the visual and creative arts compatible with evolving international standards and the work of a national data centre (Visual Arts Data Service).’ (Kultur, 2012)

A full metadata report is available at http://kultur.eprints.org/Metadata%20report%20Final.pdf

Traditionally, repositories have been text-based and the Kultur project ‘addressed the need for IRs to expand their capacity to manage non-text outputs effectively. At the same time, it has also responded to a disciplinary need for a more robust information infrastructure for practice-led research, which is particularly important for art and design as a relatively new but expanding research discipline.’ (Kultur)

Some of the drivers for creating IRs are: Open Access (OA) which in broadest terms means free and instant access to scholarly research and learning outputs; the Research Excellence Framework which is driving the need for institutions to record and manage their research outputs; and funder mandates requiring that research outputs are more readily available. The quotes below illustrate the context of these drivers.

David Willets in The Guardian on Tuesday 1st May said that ‘we will make publicly funded research accessible free of charge to readers.’ (Willets, 2012)

‘Overall availability of scholarly information will be of utmost importance in the future. The information should be available with a single mouse click, at any time and anywhere.’

‘OA, Open Content and open data are becoming part of an overall framework within universities, and the information provided by those institutions is becoming a fundamental component of public research information.’ (Mossink and Estelle, 2010:p189)

UCA Research Online began with 50 items in 2009/10 and has grown to 426 in the last two to three years. The table below compares the increase in traffic to UCA Research Online during May 2011 and May 2012. The statistics are from Google Analytics. The aim of UCA Research Online ‘is to store, share and preserve the research material produced by the University’s researchers and ensure that it reaches the widest possible audience, benefiting staff and students at UCA, and the public.’ (research.ucreative, 2012)
The Team

In January 2010 I was seconded, from my previous role as Data Quality Manager and Cataloguer, to the role of Repository and Digitisation Officer for eight months. In September 2010 the role was made permanent and I remained in post. UCA is a specialist art and design institution with campuses in Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester. There are more than 7000 students from over 70 countries study courses in art, design, architecture, media and communications.

I am the only full-time member of staff running the IR with on-site technical support from the Planning and Development Manager who is part of VADS (Visual Arts Data Service). As UCA Research Online is run on EPrints software further support is bought in from EPrints services. I report to the Library and Learning Services Central Services and Head of Collections but work closely with the Research Office.

Managing a repository

This job is varied, interesting, demanding and rewarding in equal measure and no two days are ever the same. The job can be divided into two main areas, service provision and liaison and networking. The first is to provide overall day-to-day management of the service and to undertake development of UCA Research Online as appropriate. Liaison and networking involves working with others to promote and develop the IR.

Managing UCA Research Online has many aspects and these include but are not limited to:

- the management and development of the IR
- familiarity with metadata standards and the ability to maintain these within the IR
- an understanding of the digital preservation and curation of data
- the ability to provide advice and guidance on intellectual property rights (IPR)
- advocacy to various stakeholder groups within the institution
- communication skills including the use of statistics
- the ability to promote UCA Research Online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No. of visits</th>
<th>No. of unique visits</th>
<th>% of New visitors</th>
<th>% of Returning visitors</th>
<th>No. of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>49.22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>36.58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five postcards (below) showcase some of the creative research outputs from staff and postgraduate students across our campuses. On the reverse of each postcard is information highlighting the benefits of using UCA Research Online.

![UCA Research Online](image)

Images reproduced by kind permission of the artists.

I use the traditional librarian skills in the following ways: the editing of metadata, cataloguing the artistic research outputs of our researchers, and the classification of those same items. In the course of the last two years I have also learnt more about digital curation and preservation, marketing skills, IPR and copyright. The ability to communicate effectively is very important in order to convey the appropriate tailored message to different stakeholders.
Research projects

I have been fortunate enough to participate in several JISC funded projects which have increased my understanding both of the context of IRs and the importance of their role within an institution and externally.

The first project I worked on was Kultivate which shared and supported ‘the application of best practice in the development of institutional repositories that are appropriate to the specific needs and behaviours of creative and visual arts researchers.’ (VADS, 2012) I

I contributed to the advocacy and decision making toolkit available on the following link http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/toolkits/index.html

‘Building upon the highly successful JISC funded KULTUR project (2007-2009) the eNova project seeks to extend the functionality of the EPrints open source MePrint profile tool to ensure it meets the highly specialised requirements of researchers and others in the visual and creative arts. This will include enhancements to its visual impact and ability to handle complex multimedia objects.’ (JISC, 2012) 8

I am now currently working on Kaptur which ‘will discover, create and pilot a sectoral model of best practice in the management of research data in the visual arts.’ (VADS, 2012) 9

Challenges

There are several challenges that are encountered when managing an IR. These include technical, preservation and migration of formats, interoperability, IPR and terminology. One of the recurring issues is the way UCA Research Online displays on PCs and Macs and, as yet, has not been completely resolved. Another issue is image resolution and re-sizing work appropriately to look visually good on a website but at the same time be small enough to protect work in terms of IPR.

One challenge which I am trying to resolve is the issue of classification within the UCA Research Online records. Currently researchers are asked to select a subject heading from the Library of Congress Classification (LCC), a mandatory field for text items. They are also asked to use keywords in both text and art/design items; the keywords are natural language terms which assist users in locating the item they are uploading. Examples of just some of the keywords used include: academics, animation, creative industry, digital craft, digital textiles, entrepreneurship, students and video art. The dilemma is that LCC is an internationally recognised standard yet for describing visual and creative arts it is limiting, e.g. there is no classification for animation.

The terminology used is an area which generates a great deal of debate within the community of repository managers. ‘Terminology has an impact on both the deposit process as researchers upload their content
and on users finding arts research online.’

(VADS, 2012)\textsuperscript{10} To give just a couple of examples, when uploading onto UCA Research Online there is a field for keywords which means the same as tags; also for the description of an item this could equally be labelled abstract or context.

David Baker, executive Director of The Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI) sums this up beautifully in the following way:

‘The research community in every country captures largely the same types of data. But three obstacles divide us: meaning, structure and format. These include the classic ‘lift vs. elevator’ problem – same concept with different labels – and the persistent problems of clashing data elements and software systems that can’t speak to each other. A standard dictionary implemented in our systems and exchanges removes these obstacles while keeping freedom of choice in implementation.’ (JISC, 2012)\textsuperscript{11}

Opportunities

With the challenges there are opportunities all of which raise both the profile of researchers and UCA. Currently there is a project nearing completion, to extract data from UCA Research Online so it can be searched from the library catalogue, thus creating seamlessness and greater visibility both internally and externally. In consultation with the E-Services Manager and the Data Quality Manager and Cataloguer we agreed which fields would be extracted for display on the library catalogue.

Over the last two years there have been opportunities to work more closely with the Research Office; an example of this is that staff research profiles are visible on UCA Research Online.

Recently a Digitisation Unit \url{http://community.ucreative.ac.uk/article/36707/UCA-Digitisation-Unit} was launched which will enable, with permission from researchers who have created artists’ books, the digitisation of their books. Once digitised and in a pdf format their books can be uploaded onto UCA Research Online.

In collaboration with a colleague I hope to be able to showcase research outputs from UCA Research Online on the library’s Facebook page. Recently I read an article, in the Times Higher Education Supplement, where a reader in electronic communication conducted an experiment looking at how many downloads their work in the repository received before (one or two downloads) and after they blogged and tweeted about their work. The results were startling, ‘Upon blogging and tweeting, within 24 hours, there were on average, 70 downloads.’ (Elmes, 2012)\textsuperscript{12} This illustrates just how powerful social media can be in promoting research.

These opportunities show just some of the areas for future development especially with regard to social media. There is much to be done in improving the information given in the uploading process and clearer indication is needed on where to find help on the home page of UCA Research Online.
Conclusions and Personal reflections

Although I manage UCA Research Online alone I rely on others to assist me. The increasing use of the IR is not possible without the support of my colleagues at UCA and the researchers who have uploaded material which has increased traffic to UCA Research Online.

There is a community of repository managers who have willingly shared their expertise with me and this has helped in developing UCA Research Online. I am also indebted to the Repository Support Project and to my fellow project officers on the JISC funded Projects.

The most successful aspect of managing UCA Research Online is the advocacy, promotion and meeting researchers at different campuses. Technology is phenomenal when it works but are we (the users) too reliant on it? What has been surprising is the amount of writing that is involved in running a repository. There are reports, articles and presentations to produce which gives time to reflect on progress and achievement.
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Screenshot of the homepage of UCA Research Online

The image and the thumbnails underneath are generated randomly from all the images within UCA Research Online and change regularly.
The UWE Research Repository was launched in March 2010 as a way to consolidate the University of the West of England’s research outputs and, where possible, to make them publicly available. There are two members of staff who work on the repository, a Repository Manager, who is responsible for development of the repository, strategic planning and the training of users, and an Administrator who checks the records entered by users and maintains the data in the repository. Neither of us is an experienced cataloguer. However, a significant part of our job is cataloguing repository entries so we do have a basic awareness of metadata schemas.

As with a number of UK universities, the repository uses the EPrints software produced by the University of Southampton. UWE allows researchers to submit their own metadata records, with attached versions of the published output where possible, for inclusion in the repository. The metadata is then checked by the Administrator to ensure that it is accurate before being made live. UWE researchers work in a wide variety of disciplines and research output is in a range of formats, and this has made it particularly difficult to create a consistent style of cataloguing. This in turn can make it difficult for users searching the repository to find relevant items.

About seventy percent of traffic to the repository comes via Google. When Google searches the repository it looks at both the metadata record and any full text item attached to it. This means that repository items appearing in search results will usually be the result of terms found in the full text item, rather than in the metadata record. As such, it would appear at first glance that formal cataloguing of a repository entry isn’t a particularly important part of this process. However, there are many items in the repository where the full text item doesn’t lend itself to this kind of searching.

UWE’s Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education produces many items that defy full text searching because they are image-based, rather than text-based. *Hedgewitch* (Banks, 2008) ([http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/15950/](http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/15950/)), a short film, is one example, as Google would be unable to search the video file attached to the record. This could be remedied, at least in part, by providing a copy of the script as supplemental material. However, other video items in the repository defy this approach: for example, ‘*Computation by competing patterns in cellular automata, not-majority binary adder implementation*’ (Martinez, 2010). The full text of this item is a series of tracks that are simultaneously shaded (Figure 1. [http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/8364/](http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/8364/)). Clearly, providing a transcript for an item such as this would be impossible.

Some items are even more difficult to classify. “idonthaveyourmarbles” is an e-bay account that sells a variety of eccentric items (Figure 2). It is officially listed in the repository as a Show/Exhibition. However, while the physical exhibition connected with this project had a specific date attached to it, the project continues and is
constantly updated with new items.

Figure 1

Creating metadata for such diverse material within a single environment presents a significant challenge. If we want our users to be able to search within the entirety of our repository’s data and locate the full range of our resources from a single search, there needs to be at least some level of consistency between the records.

Figure 2
To achieve this consistency, the UWE Research Repository uses the Dublin Core (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, 2010a) metadata schema. Dublin Core has the advantage of being flexible while providing a minimum metadata standard for all records within the repository, ensuring a basic level of consistency between records. Most EPrints based repositories use Dublin Core as this is the schema that the software uses out of the box. As such, these repositories effectively operate at Level 1 of the Dublin Core interoperability Levels; Shared Term Definitions. This is useful as it allows for sharing of data between these repositories. So if an academic moves from one institution to another then their data can be moved with them.

Of course, not all repository staff across institutions use Dublin Core in the same way. Some may, for example, record papers published in conference proceedings in a similar way to books, while others might record them alongside the details of the conference itself. On top of this, many repositories add or amend fields to record additional data. This is because the Dublin Core metadata schema currently in use in many repositories does not, on its own, provide enough fields to cater for the wide variety of resources they hold. This has resulted in most repository administrators creating additional fields and terms to support their entries. Universities have different needs to one another and some will need additional data whilst others will not. This can result in data being difficult to import if the receiving repository has no appropriate field to store it in.

There are a number of potential solutions to these problems. For art and design materials, there are a range of metadata schemas that may be appropriate. For example, the Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA) (J.Paul Getty Trust 2010) defines categories for use in describing and accessing information about art, architecture or cultural objects, along with any related images (Grant & TASI, 2006).

Alternatively, a more appropriate metadata schema to use may be the one developed by the Kultur project (http://kultur.eprints.org/). The Kultur project was a JISC-funded project that ran from 2007 to 2009. It was set up to create a model institutional repository for use in the creative arts, and aimed to showcase outputs such as films, photography and paintings. In order to do this, the project established a metadata schema that was appropriate for arts outputs. Repositories that hold arts materials are generally aware of the Kultur project, and if they were all to adopt this metadata schema there would likely be more consistent metadata, and therefore greater potential for interoperability, across these repositories.

However, this only solves the problem for art and design metadata. For interdisciplinary repositories such as the UWE Research Repository, there needs to be a metadata schema that can cope with the wide range of materials the repository holds. It might therefore be worth considering a different approach. Adopting Level 2 of Dublin Core Interoperability; Formal Semantic Interoperability, (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, 2010b) and utilising the more recent DCMI (ibid) metadata terms within repositories, rather than the original Dublin Core schema, would mean that every record would have a core set of metadata terms. This would ensure that...
the range of terms that could be utilised, both for describing items and effective searching, would increase. These terms would need to be entered in a precise manner to describe the item. This would provide a basic standard between records across repositories and allow records to be imported and exported more smoothly. However, this approach may result in too restrictive a set of metadata terms, and once again result in repository administrators feeling the need to create additional fields and terms to support their entries.

One current development within the repository community is to use an application profile. Application profiles allow particular user communities or organisations to define a more specific metadata schema that is fit for a certain purpose. A repository community can define a metadata schema by selecting metadata terms from one or more existing metadata standards. Application profiles can have new elements added to them, but may not add terms to an existing standard. A number of application profiles have been developed by building on the Dublin Core standard, but they are all intended to support the description of a specific type of work. For example, there is an e-thesis application profile and an images application profile (JISC 2012).

It seems that when it comes to metadata schemas for repositories, there is no obvious one-size-fits-all approach. Dublin Core was originally adopted by repositories for its simplicity and flexibility, whilst still providing a minimum standard. The updated DCMI metadata terms may improve the way in which repository items can be catalogued, as they provide a richer use of metadata. However, there is no guarantee that even this schema will accommodate the range of entries in a truly interdisciplinary institutional repository.
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Introduction to NECTAR

The project to set up the University of Northampton’s open access institutional repository was begun in 2007. Prompted by the RAE (Research Assessment Exercise), with its demands for comprehensive research output data and evidence of support for research activity, members of both the research community and the Library identified an opportunity to collaborate on a new digital repository. It remains a joint endeavour between Library and Learning Services, and the research community at the university – it is not just a ‘library thing’.

Two groups were formed to further the project: a Steering Group, comprising members of both the research community and our department; and a Project Team, of which I was a part, and which was responsible for the day to day management and operation of the project.

The repository was soon christened NECTAR (Northampton Electronic Collection of Theses and Research). It was designed to capture, showcase and preserve the University’s scholarly research output, including PhD and MPhil, but not undergraduate, theses. NECTAR’s theses can now be harvested by the British Library’s thesis service, EThOS.

Eprints software was selected, specifically the ‘Professional package’ offered by Eprints Services. This software is based on the Dublin Core metadata standard. It also provides for enhancing the records with Library of Congress classification.

Initially this was a mediated service – the School admin teams (usually the School Secretary) were trained to enter the metadata, the items being visible only to NECTAR Project Team staff. Since 2011, academics have been able to self-archive. They are now much more engaged with the process, and aware of the value-added services NECTAR provides for them.

The University Annual Research Report is now generated directly from NECTAR.

Although the start-up project is over, the Team still exists, as there is ongoing development work on NECTAR dealing with preservation issues, copyright concerns, the addition of full text, and of multimedia items, and further researcher engagement. NECTAR will shortly be enabled to assemble and submit the necessary publication information to the Research Excellence Framework (REF), for the University.

Current Repository Team

1. Research Support Librarian, who heads up all Research support for our Library and Learning Services

2. Research Information Specialist, whose special responsibility is to administer NECTAR, including liaison with content providers; checks and enhances metadata; verifies intellectual property rights; prepares full content for deposit; generates reports and statistics

3. Information Systems Developer, who deals with all the technical issues around NECTAR

4. Metadata Specialist, who adds some new entries, checks and enhances metadata as part of quality control, adds Library of Congress subject classifications, checks presentation, makes entries ‘live’

5. Cataloguing Assistant, who has also been trained to add subject classifications, and verify metadata.
My Part

Metadata

My job title is Metadata Specialist, and I was fortunate in that it was felt useful that someone with metadata skills be involved as part of the Project Team from the beginning. Indeed, one of NECTAR’s selling points to the University is the high quality of its metadata.

I was involved in the selection of the software, then the subsequent organisation of the metadata fields within that to enable the entries to be presented in the Harvard Referencing style format. I was also involved in the design of the fields within the template, so that the relevant metadata fields were available for each type of item. The fields available for a journal article, for example, won’t necessarily be the same as those for a radio/TV interview.

I attended a Repository Support Project event that was held about this time, on metadata for repositories. So I was able not only to brush up on my knowledge of the Dublin Core elements, but also to actually work with them for our repository project.

Currently I spend approximately one day each week on NECTAR work, although this increases at busy times.

Issues

- **Accuracy of metadata** (dates, location etc.). The potential for (albeit unintended) inaccurate metadata is great. Checking is paramount.

- **School of Arts entries** – pictures, artists’ exhibitions, artefacts, artists’ books, don’t all fit into the metadata fields template very easily. This is resolved by discussion with the Head of the School of Arts, and with the rest of the Team, to achieve the best presentation of these more problematic entries.

- **Workload priorities**. Entries appear in the Review area in a sporadic manner, so sometimes I am swamped by a huge number waiting to be checked and made live, particularly when the Annual Research Report deadline is coming. This then impacts on my workload, causing time management issues.

Cataloguing

Cataloguing skills are a great asset for working with a repository. The same skills required for cataloguing are required for entering or checking metadata in a repository – attention to detail, accuracy, speed, consistency, the following of set rules and standards, verifying of data, authority control, punctuation. Whereas normally the cataloguer is entering data into fields in the MARC21 record format, to create an end record following AACR2 or RDA standards, in the repository we are using the elements in the Dublin Core format, to create a citation (or record) following the Harvard Referencing format.

Issues

- **Authority control**. Different people were entering different forms of name for creator, resulting in multiple entries in the name browse list for the same person. This was solved by our technical person in conjunction with Eprints – these are now auto-completed as soon as typing begins. However, occasionally the auto-complete fails (either because for a spell it seems to get switched off or because folk type too fast!) then duplicate names still end up on the browse list. Periodically this is checked for duplicate names and fixed manually. I keep my beady eye on the creator names to pre-empt this. The same facility is there for item titles and conference titles. This not only picks up duplicate entries, but at the same time helps with
consistency in these fields.

- **Consistency.** I produced a set of guidelines covering, for example, the use of capital letters for different types of heading; what to do with a recurring honorary role (treated rather like a journal catalogue record); the same exhibition or paper given in different locations in the same year – this is entered on one record that includes them all. I have found my cataloguing background incredibly useful in sorting out these types of issues, or discussing them with and advising the Project Team. This crib sheet has proved invaluable whenever a new person comes on board to help with NECTAR, although it is now covered in scribbled annotations and needs a new edition!

I also contributed to the online field ‘help’ information. This is available to the user at the point of entry in each field and so useful to researchers as well as repository staff. It helps in the effort to achieve consistency in metadata presentation.

**Classification**

It was felt by the Research Support Librarian that adding subject classifications to the records would add value to them, in addition to the uncontrolled keywords that in some cases were not provided. Adding the Library of Congress classifications provides some vocabulary control and consistency over the subjects.

My knowledge and experience of the principles of subject classification (although not of Library of Congress!) were very useful. Also, having classified library stock at the University for some years, I had already gained some subject knowledge of the research areas being covered as the academics tend to research around the subjects they teach.
Issues

- **Classification scheme provided ‘out of the box’ too broad.** Eprints provides the basic Library of Congress classification outline, but we quickly found that these classes were too broad, and decided to add to the subject tree in NECTAR, the more relevant ones from the sub-classes, which are freely available on the LOC website. We have continued to add more as different subjects are covered. This took up extra time at the outset, less so now, as we already have most of those we use regularly. Up to three subject classes per NECTAR item entry are added.

Conclusions

Being part of the NECTAR team has given me the opportunity to use my cataloguing skills in a different area of work. I have enjoyed learning something different, and developing the skills I already had. I was forced into learning more about LOC classification, and this has proved useful in my normal cataloguing work – I now know what these are when I see them on catalogue records! What is exciting is that the institutional repository arena is continuing to move forward, and I am pleased to continue to be part of it.
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Background to Open Access at Royal Holloway

**Royal Holloway, University of London** is part of the federal University of London system, and is one of the **1994 Group** of “smaller, research intensive” universities. The College has been involved in activities relating to open access for some time now. The Library Service has been part of the **SHERPA-LEAP** consortium since its inception in February 2004.

Membership of LEAP meant that Royal Holloway was able to benefit from an **EPrints** repository hosted by UCL as part of a subsidiary project. At the end of the term the repository was moved back into Royal Holloway’s own infrastructure and hosting was taken over by Royal Holloway’s own IT department, who opted to use **Equella** software.

The College has also adopted a firm stance from a policy point of view, with the adoption of two institutional policies designed to ensure the widest possible dissemination of its research outputs. The first was the **Open Access Publications Policy**, which requires all staff to make their research outputs available in an open access format wherever it is possible to do so (using the repository as a platform), which was implemented to be effective from October 2010 onwards.

To complement this, Research Council also approved a new **E-Thesis Submission Policy**, which requires all new PhD theses to be made available on an open access basis wherever possible. Students can request access restrictions on their theses of up to two, three or five years, depending on circumstances.

The Open Access Publication Policy and the E-Thesis Submission Policy are both institutional policies, rather than library policies, and although the Library Service has led the move towards open access, the College has benefitted from high-level institutional support for all these open access initiatives, which has certainly eased their implementation. However, in spite of ongoing advocacy activities undertaken by the library’s Digital Collections & Research Information Team, the academic reception has been mixed, with some academic departments displaying little motivation for open access.

Implementing a Current Research Information System (CRIS) – The Library Perspective

In 2010, Royal Holloway acquired and deployed a brand new Current Research Information System (CRIS), using **Pure** software, which is a product of a Danish company, Atira. Whereas the implementation of the open access repository was a matter for library and IT staff to handle, rolling out Pure was very much a College-wide initiative.

The procurement process involved a number of senior members of staff including the Vice-Principal for Research, Enterprise & Communications, the Director of Strategy and the Head of Research & Enterprise.
Pure was purchased with a number of objectives in mind. The most pressing was to have a means of handling the College’s submission for the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework (REF) in 2014. Beyond that, Pure will provide a platform to gather, process and (where appropriate) make available information relating to the research activities undertaken within the College.

It was always the intention that Pure should link to the existing open access repository, and that it should provide a single interface by which academics could submit versions of their research papers for research management/REF purposes, and to make a version available on an open access basis.

In addition to the main Pure product, Royal Holloway opted for the Pure Portal, which would display research information via web pages designed to match the latest College style sheets. Pure, and the new portal web pages were deployed at around the same time as the new-look College website was rolled out. Initially, staff in the IT, Research & Enterprise and Library Services helped to manually upload staff publications to the system, and all academic colleagues were offered the opportunity to submit publication lists to be uploaded to the new-look pages. This offer came with a deadline, after which, academic colleagues would be expected to maintain their own profiles and to keep their own publications and personal details up to date.

### Linking CRIS and Repository – Workflow Considerations

Like most research information systems, Pure comes with a workflow that is designed to allow system administrators to check, or ‘validate’ material submitted to the system before it goes live. At Royal Holloway, it was decided not to use the workflow for two reasons. Firstly, it was felt to be important that, for colleagues to engage with the system, they should be able to see changes they make to their web pages instantly rather than having to wait for new documents to be checked by an administrator (as in the typical repository-style workflow). Secondly, at the point of roll-out, there was not the staffing resource available to carry out such checking adequately.

A connection was specified that would take full-text documents submitted to Pure and transfer them to the existing Equella repository for accessibility and preservation. It had been decided to continue to use Equella as the document store for the repository as it provided a good fit with Equella continuing to be used as a the main platform for digital content within Royal Holloway. Upon deployment of this connector, full text content that had previously been added to Pure was transferred to the repository.

### The Academic Perspective

Academic colleagues have generally adapted well to using Pure to maintain their profiles and publications lists. Of course, they have provided a wealth of feedback during the testing phases and since the system went live. They generally find Pure easy to use which reduces the burden on the administration, which is shared between IT, Research & Enterprise and Library Services.

Generally, academic colleagues are keen to engage with the system as it is their means of maintaining information about their publications and research activities on their College web pages. Since the
implementation of the connection to the repository, this has caused some problems for the library, as academics occasionally try to add a publisher’s PDF to their website where the publisher’s permissions do not allow this. Library staff regularly check newly submitted documents and will endeavour to replace these with preprints or postprints if publishers permit.

Without a doubt, using Pure has hugely increased interest in open access and deposits to the repository. This is for a number of reasons. Firstly, Pure does much more for them than the repository ever did; it handles complex information about grants, projects, outputs, impacts, students, and projects, with publications being just one of many types of data.

Secondly, many academics want to make publications available via their web pages, so the provision of a single point of upload to the repository that matches this makes things very easy.

Finally, even for those few academic colleagues who have not added much content to Pure, they are now being asked to do so as part of Royal Holloway’s preparations for the forthcoming REF. Essentially, publications need to be added to Pure in order to form part of the REF submission.

Cataloguing Considerations

Equella is used to support a number of collections across various departments at Royal Holloway, but only two of these collections are administered by the library – Royal Holloway Research Online (the open access repository) and a separate, closed collection to hold past exam papers, which is only available on campus, or off-campus using a staff or student login.

In common with most UK repositories, the library has never created separate library catalogue records for electronic items held in its open access repository. One key aim is to make the repository’s contents widely available via open access, so Google becomes the primary route to discovery. Of course, it is also important to ensure that staff and students of the College have access to its own research outputs, especially where the library does not have a current subscription to that content.

The Library Service is in the process of implementing a new “Library Search” service, which is made up of a VuFind front end on top of Summon. It was decided at an early stage that this service should search the open access and exam paper collections in Equella, as well as the library catalogue (Ex Libris Aleph) and that of the College Archives (Axiell’s CALM).

Summon makes use of OAI-PMH (Open Archives Initiatives Protocol for Metadata Harvesting) feeds from the Equella repository to surface records about its contents.

This has worked very well so far, and this automation between the two systems has made it very easy for library staff to change repository contents and to see these changes reflected in Library Search immediately.
Until 2011, the library held print copies of exam papers in stock, which of course required catalogue records to be created in Aleph. During the first year of the withdrawal of the print stock, catalogue records were maintained in Aleph, pointing to the electronic copy in Equella. This proved to be costly, time-consuming and difficult to maintain, so it has been decided that for the 2012-2013 academic year, the library will remove exam paper catalogue records from Aleph and rely on other means for discovery. Students at Royal Holloway make use of the Moodle Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), so as long as each course unit within Moodle provides a link to the relevant exam paper in Equella, this will provide the best route of access for students. In addition to this, discovery is via links from the library homepage, and, of course, Library Search.

Conclusions

The implementation of Pure in conjunction with Equella has been a lengthy but worthwhile exercise, as it has increased the number of deposits in the repository as well as the rate of deposit. It has provided a better user experience for the academic and enables us to link publication to research projects, funding and impacts as well as to staff and students.
The moment when the cataloguing world and the repository world converged for me was in 2003. The place was the eleventh floor of the Livingstone Tower in Glasgow, then home of the Centre for Digital Library Research (CDLR) at the University of Strathclyde. The reason was a JISC project called HaIRST - *Harvesting Institutional Resources in Scotland Testbed*, a project in which St Andrews was a partner. The amazing views of Glasgow will be forever associated with HaIRST meetings and with my introduction to “repository speak”, to the new buzzwords of metadata, OAI-PMH, interoperability, harvesting and discovery.

In the beginning it was rather unclear who would represent St Andrews on the project. Perhaps this was indicative of the lack of awareness of what a “repository” could represent and what sort of data it could contain. As we now know, there is no hard and fast definition of this and content can be very diverse. Our participation had been initiated by a Vice Principal with a background in IT and there was preliminary talk among academic staff of setting up an eprints archive. The most likely project representative seemed to be our University Archivist. The project title appeared to match their job title, but our archivist begged to differ. Library managers thought about how to match existing skills and experience to this new project and came up with an answer “Why not send a cataloguer?” And so it began.

So why is a cataloguer suited to repository work?

My cataloguing experience had started straight away after finishing a PG qualification in the 1980s. I hadn’t been altogether sure if this was my real long-term choice of specialism within the profession. Cataloguers were traditionally hidden behind the scenes and that wasn’t particularly appealing. However, what did appeal was the power to organise and control bibliographic data, especially in order to make that data available in a key library service, the Library catalogue. Universal Bibliographic Control was the mantra of the time, albeit only then in the context of print resources. Underlying all of this was the technological shift of paper and microfiche catalogues to online systems and the growth of bibliographic utilities, which could readily provide sources of catalogue records.

I spent a period of time simply cataloguing and learning the tools of the trade. New acquisitions at St Andrews were varied, with a significant percentage of foreign language material and a healthy amount of “grey” literature and older publications. AACR, MARC, LCC and LCSH were the cornerstones, and standards closely adhered to. By the 1990s I led the cataloguing team at St Andrews and had gained valuable experience in working closely on three catalogue data system migrations, moving us initially from microfiche and finally to a webpac interface. By the early 2000s that experience had extended even further with a migration from UKMARC to MARC21 and a period of time as the Library Systems manager. In the meantime, there were extensive retrospective cataloguing projects in progress. We also embarked on rare book projects which showed me how bibliographic descriptions could be augmented and extended into new areas: for example physical descriptions of bindings, provenance notes, genre headings and specialist indexes for rare book printers and publishers. By 2003 we had started to grapple with the new dimension of electronic publications, especially electronic journals. Working on the look and feel of webpacs and how we displayed, indexed and presented our catalogue data to our users taught me to always remember the end user and the importance of the public facing service we provide.
So how did this prepare me for the projects we embarked on from 2003 onwards? I understood the structure and organisation of bibliographic data. I knew about a variety of formats and was starting to understand the demands of cataloguing electronic resources. I had experienced detailed data migrations and covered the minutiae of mapping data fields and subfields, as well as understanding how that data could be indexed and displayed in library systems. I had become well acquainted with quality control, standards, productivity and project management with regard to data. Data should be fit for purpose and sometimes it needed to be sophisticated as shown by rare book and retro projects. Efficiency dictated that we should reuse data and source readymade data as much as possible. Better still, data upgraded at local institutions could be contributed back to large national and global data aggregations to improve discovery for users and to put that data back into the pot for reuse by other institutions.

Perhaps what I should particularly highlight are metadata skills. This is a fundamental transferable skill to support repository work and probably deserves a heading on its own. Identifying data elements and structures is key, whether this is in a MARC21 database or a Dublin Core repository.

In retrospect I can see that all of this was leading towards digital projects and new ways to present our data. But perhaps this wasn’t immediately obvious at the time. In 2003 the cataloguer’s role was still determined by being limited mainly to the print material that traditionally made up a library catalogue database. It required the creation of other silos of data to break this tradition. It required coming out of the catalogue box, taking on digital projects, transferring skills and understanding different approaches and solutions.

Repository development

By the end of 2005 the HaIRST project had reported its results and we had produced a local project report about our St Andrews experiences. We were convinced that developing a repository solution for institutional research publications and especially for electronic theses was a strategic priority. We moved forward with a DSpace repository using Dublin Core metadata and hosted by the Scottish Digital Library Consortium. Parallel to this we worked on the institutional policy and infrastructure to support an e-theses mandate.

Does a cataloguer still have a lot to learn?

The answer to this is an emphatic yes. As described earlier, existing skills and experiences were invaluable for the setup of a new database and implementing enhanced structures and metadata content. The EThOS toolkit provided valuable help with information about UKETD_DC: the metadata core set of recommended Dublin Core fields for theses and dissertations and the UKETD_DC Application Profile. I could see that previous database management skills would expedite the DSpace setup. Knowledge of subject indexing schemes such as LCSH and LC would add value to repository metadata.

But there is still a lot to learn in order to set up and manage a repository service. One key element is to learn to accept and embrace user-generated metadata. The repository is a good exemplar of this and although quality control is still very important it is helpful to develop a healthy and pragmatic attitude to data quality in a user-driven environment. A certain amount of compromise is required when implementing what are accepted and given standards in the catalogue world. Authority control is a good example of something that requires development and patience.
These are just the metadata-related issues. On top of this is a whole raft of skills and knowledge to develop. A repository manager needs to understand open access in all its forms and to understand the research publication process. They need to acquire new knowledge about publisher policies, licensing and copyright issues. They need to understand their institutional environment, especially when implementing new policies to make digital material available. This was certainly our experience in providing an e-theses service. Add to this an awareness of preservation issues, an understanding of open source software, confidentiality issues, the design of effective workflows to meet the needs of users and of other central services within the institution. A crucial element is to understand the many aspects of the academic mind, how research is carried out, how it is transformed into publications and how those publications support career development. It is difficult to prepare for this learning curve but it would be much tougher without having a background in the transferable skills already described.

The pay off and the benefits

There is always something to compensate for the hours spent trying to understand the Scholarly Works Application Profile and how this might relate to your repository metadata. Or to make up for the work to map data elements from a Research information system into DC with crosswalks involving schemas like MODS. New skills promote professional development. Repository work has extended my contacts and communication into a whole new community beyond the cataloguing community. It has led me to a variety of workshops, meetings and conferences across both the library sector and, more recently, the research management sector and has proved to be a source of genuine satisfaction and professional development.

This is now reflected in my own job title and also the way my role fits into the Library organisational structure. My Head of Cataloguing role is part of the Collections Management Division of the Library service, but my Head of Repository Services role is part of the Academic Liaison Team, in recognition of the user based services and liaison opportunities for research support which these services provide. It is also mirrored in another member of the Cataloguing/Liaison team who originally catalogued print theses for the Library catalogue and is now a key member of staff in the e-theses service. One element of that workflow is to link thesis records in the Library catalogue to their corresponding digital entries in the repository and to ensure that both sets of metadata are suitably enhanced. It’s a fitting reminder of the close relationship between the services and the skills needed in both systems and one also described in a previous issue of Catalogue and Index.

Momentum and new services

Repository services at St Andrews have recently expanded and this has been reflected in the development of a repository team. From its inception in 2007 the repository Research@StAndrews:Full text has now become part of an integrated set of services. One primary emphasis is on integration with the University’s research information system, a CRIS using PURE software and this aims to capture the research output of the University, providing open access full text for publications wherever possible. In addition, the Library offers a journal hosting service using Open Journals Software.

Interestingly structures and workflows in research information systems parallel those of cataloguing and repository systems. Publications data is sourced and reused from external sources wherever possible. Data is moved in and moved out and repurposed into aggregations for research groups or research pools. Quality
control and workflows are established. Access is required through subject metadata. Public interfaces are essential to promote institutional research. New data models such as CERIF are now becoming well established in the field and become another essential standard for the cataloguer and repository manager to absorb.

It is encouraging to see that cataloguing skills and repository skills can transfer yet again to this new service environment. Research information systems will be instrumental in providing accurate and precise bibliographic data for the upcoming REF research assessment exercise and this itself positions bibliographical skills centre stage. My own role seems to be travelling along a path of increased integration. As cataloguing, repository and research information systems develop and integrate so the interdependencies of these teams within the institution demonstrate increased integration. The associated skills and knowledge also moves around within these teams and is exchanged and consolidated. Thus in St Andrews there has been a very real cooperative approach to these services across the Library, IT services and the Research Policy Office.

The future

Clearly the role of the cataloguer can transform in the repository and research information environment. So what of the library catalogue itself: has it moved with the times and out of its own silo? It was once the flagship and sole database for many libraries, but now it is one of many competing databases, many of which reflect digital content. Discovery services such as the SEEKER service at St Andrews, using the EBSCO discovery platform, provide a blend of institutional and external content and a centralised institutional entry point into information resources. In this sort of service, catalogue content and repository content is served up in the same interface. Behind this of course is a spot of catalogue data mapping and some OAI harvesting. But the data stands up remarkably well to this sort of interface, perhaps testament to the involvement of cataloguers in repositories? In this environment the catalogue itself seems to have undergone the same journey and joined an integrated service in the same way as the staff creating it.

I would encourage cataloguers to get involved in repository and related services. You have more in common with these services than you may think. Get out of your comfort zone. Your knowledge and skills are building blocks for repository services. The current buzz is research data management. Perhaps we will send a cataloguer or a repository manager to the first project meeting on research data? What this is really about is transferable skills which our profession excels in. We can all adapt, although perhaps cataloguers are demonstrating their expertise in adapting more than most.
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Practical cataloguing: AACR, RDA and MARC21
Anne Welsh and Sue Batley
Reviewed by Katie Flanagan, Rare Books and Special Collections Librarian
Royal College of Physicians

Practical cataloguing is the successor to John Bowman’s Essential cataloguing, aimed at those learning cataloguing for the first time but also a useful refresher for those with more experience. It is a very encouraging book, clearly setting out the background to cataloguing standards that have led up to RDA, and putting these in context. There is a clear explanation of FRBR, and how this builds on what went before. All of this is explained in a chatty, friendly style, making the subject much easier to understand.

The book takes the reader through the description of bibliographic elements, explaining how these are dealt with in both AACR2 and RDA. It is set out clearly, including excerpts from the standards and with examples to illustrate each point. This is followed by a chapter on access points and headings, again with plenty of examples in both AACR2 and RDA. There are chapters on RDA, the main changes it means for cataloguing and its foundations in FRBR, as well as how it differs from AACR2, and how it can be used in MARC21.

The book is highly readable, and works well reading from cover to cover, although it is also very easy to dip into to find relevant information or examples. It does a good job of covering and explaining the state of flux as few libraries so far have adopted RDA, as well as helpful tips about what to do in the interim. There are many examples showing AACR2 and RDA examples next to each other for easy comparison.

One of the most useful features I found was the Practice notes interspersed throughout the text. These highlight cataloguing issues to be aware of, such as where local cataloguing may differ from the theory, the limitations of an LMS or how the implications of taking a decision to move to RDA may affect your records. Some are pitfalls of which the beginner cataloguer should be aware, but others have implications for the whole catalogue. There is a good index, which I found useful when writing cataloguing guidelines, and a bibliography, from which several items have already been added to my list of “must reads” and I now have several blogs and websites bookmarked to keep up to date with RDA developments. I highly recommend reading it, both for novice cataloguers and those trying to work out how RDA will affect their work.
This seminar was almost entirely Web 2.0 related, which I found surprising with the forthcoming cataloguing changes related to RDA, and the growing movement to support data management in institutional repositories. However, it was still interesting to find out how different libraries are using Web 2.0 technologies.

Nora McGregor (British Library) detailed the support for digital researchers by the BL. They thought the future digital researcher would require multiple screens at each desk to hold a user’s Dropbox/Google Docs accounts and Twitter/blog feeds. However, after creating multi-screen desks and then surveying the users, the BL found researchers didn’t use social media to communicate their research and most said they would prefer not to come into the library. The BL concluded from this that their position was to be more than content providers, but to be advisors/facilitators and keep abreast of technological changes.

Lynn Corrigan (Napier University) talked about Twitter and its benefits. Although I have had a Twitter account for 1.5 years I didn’t use it. I’ve now changed the parties I’m following to include more institutions/events, to keep updated with those and to reduce the number of ‘trivial’ tweets. As Lynn said, Twitter is just another method of communicating and changing your visibility, and both are even more necessary currently.

Bryan Christie (National Library of Scotland) discussed how he was using social media to promote the library’s content and communicate with the public. Bryan also showed how he was using analytics to quantify their social media activity, ie. Facebook Insights, listing number of page views and ‘reach’ of a page. He concluded by saying you need to continually try things, monitor the outcomes and reflect on their success (or not).

The Mobile Strategies for Libraries (Karen Stevenson and Kay Munro) presentation was based on activity at Glasgow University. This is very relevant now as internet-capable mobile devices started outselling computers from late 2011. Looking at the changes in numbers of mobile internet users and the platforms used over the eight months between surveys illustrated the speed of changes in this area and the need for continual innovation in a mobile strategy. Perhaps the biggest restriction to use of mobile library services that was found was a lack of awareness of it by students. In March, GU offered a mobile library account interface and catalogue search but I’m sure by now there will have been further developments!

The development of the Edinburgh University application was reviewed by Martin Morrey. Interestingly Martin said they were trying to get some PC functionality onto mobile devices to reduce PC demand, but didn’t say what was envisioned.

The use and benefits of Library Libguides at St. Andrews University was described by Vicki Cormie. This was the most useful and interesting presentation of the day for me, as this tool provides the subject information/guidance still greatly required, but available remotely to suit the current reluctance of users to visit the library. The degree of support by Springshare (the vendor) and sharing of ideas/designs by other institutions was certainly a change to that associated with other software packages I have seen. Tying in with the day’s themes Library Libguides are mobile-friendly and provide statistics showing page/resource use.

Nicola Osbourne finished off the day by reviewing Web 2.0 developments over 2011; namely the creation of Google/Facebook Timelines and privacy terms issues for Google and Facebook (connected to, and separate from, the Timelines). The increasing use of metadata (albeit under different names) was also listed, eg. time/date/location tagging of photos and self-publishing on the Kindle. The latter requires metadata from authors to enable seamless sharing between a user’s friends.

Thanks to SCIGS for giving me a (student) discounted entry and thanks for the eye-opening seminar and opportunity to network.
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