

Minutes of Catalogers Group Meeting

April 10, 2003

Attending: Gia Aivazian, Sharon Benamou, Valerie Bross, Beth Feinberg, Joan LoPear, Janice Matthiesen, Renée McBride Caroline Miller, Jeff Morehead, Nancy Norris (Recorder), Paul Priebe, Louise Ratliff, Angela Riggio, John Riemer, Rita Stumps.

I. Report on Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) 2003 conference, Baltimore, Maryland (Nancy)

Nancy's primary purpose for attending this year's conference was to present the 24th annual George Wittenborn Memorial Book Award at the ARLIS/NA Convocation. The Wittenborn is presented each year to notable art books published in North America and is considered ARLIS' most prestigious book award. As chair of the 2002 committee, Nancy and three other art librarians selected the winner from 116 submissions. The winning title was:

Alfred Stieglitz: the Key Set: the Alfred Stieglitz Collection of Photographs by Sarah Greenough, published by the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. and Harry N. Abrams.

Among sessions attended was *Searching the Visible and Invisible Web* which while basic, was interesting and informative. Highlights from the presentation may be found at <http://tinyurl.com/7ws4>

Nancy also attended the Cataloging Problems Discussion Group which is an ARLIS staple. This year three policy specialists from the Library of Congress attended, Robert Ewald, Robert Hiatt, and Milicent Wewerka. They discussed the future of AACR with regard to incorporating FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographical Records) terminology developed by IFLA into AACR terms of reference. For more on FRBR see: <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/frbr1.html> Milicent expressed concern about the impact this would have on the resulting loss of access to relator terms such as illustrators in bibliographic records. UCLA doesn't use them as TAOS can't display them. That may not be true for a future ILS. However, a delimiter 4 relator code does display. Milicent said that a Michael Gorman-like visionary is being sought to edit the new AACR. Currently it is filled with redundancies and glossary terms need redefinition especially those that were developed for the card catalog. The JSC is rewriting the introductions to AACR parts 1 and 2 and will possibly develop part 3 for authority control work. Additionally, world-wide regional meetings sponsored by IFLA are scheduled this year in Frankfurt, Germany to create a more international standard.

To the question why were some groups of artists in SAF and some in NAF Bob Hiatt responded that according to LC, they are supposed to be set up as subjects. However, if it can be demonstrated that a group is not merely a loose association of the like-minded such as the *Blaue Reiter*, but has a corporate structure such as *Gilbert & George*, then one may set it up as a 110. Cues to corporate-ness include a formal organizational structure or a bank account, et al. As for incorrectly set up NAFs, LC reminded everyone that NACO independents are free to dump authorities into the AF. LC does not look over the submissions unless asked to or there is a bounce due to a mechanical problem with the record. Unlike Editorial which oversees subjects, no one at LC has time to review NAFs.

There was a discussion of the corporate body qualifier "Firm". Bob Hiatt said that the rules instruct you to use a general term and what is wrong with "Firm"? Remember, you are only trying to identify the body, not be encyclopedic. The Catalogers Group discussed qualifiers.

Regarding the SAF/NAF placement of corporate bodies, John recalled his past NACO experience involving "Programs" and "Projects." Catalogers used to spend time determining if a program or project had staff, before proceeding to establish such an entity as a corporate body in the Names file, tagged 110. When LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office found out catalogers were consuming time this way, they issued a directive, around 1993, encouraging automatic acceptance of programs and projects as corporate bodies. The results can be questionable under this approach. A university's "Dance Program" may just be a series of courses one can take, and a better access point on a bib record would be the name of the Department or School on campus offering the courses. Other entities, featuring the word "Project" or "Program" may merely represent (the title of) an activity of a particular corporate body, and the latter might be a better candidate for an access point for a responsible body. Example: Project Alpha (n92-801192) ("program ... designed by the Association of Operating Room Nurses")

A representative from the Morgan Library announced that the vocabulary for images established by the Index for Christian Art has been added to the MARC list of codes; it is ICA.

II. Discussion of two Cuttering policy questions (John)

John asked us if we should Cutter our call numbers according to the UCLA shelflist and/or to the Library of Congress'. Cuttering here means everything to the right of the subfield '\$b.' Valerie asked if we are Cuttering for uniqueness or for order, which are two different purposes. It is getting very difficult to Cutter for order. General agreement. Certainly we only Cutter Belles-lettres for uniqueness at this point since we no longer use Cutter-Sanborn. John wondered if we are checking Cutters against the LC online shelflist or against ORION2. Rita said we are pushing through DLC rapid cat without checking to see if the call numbers fit in our shelflist. Renée asked about PCC--is anyone checking those numbers? Copycataloging is not checking to see if these, or any numbers, are Cuttered to fit the LC shelflist. The requirement for BIBCO is merely to provide classification from one established scheme. If Cuttering is optional at the national level, it certainly appears to be sufficient to Cutter only against our shelflist locally (to obtain a unique number).

Full-cataloging for SRLF: what if we provided only a class number and didn't Cutter at all? Wouldn't that save time? This utilizes classification as a subject indexing language, omitting a Cutter seems harmless if we are never going to shelve or subarrange with it. This practice already occurs with e-resources cataloged on a separate record. Everyone seemed okay with this, although not everyone felt it would save significant time. Rita expressed concern that browsability would be impaired. The current OPAC makes it hard to browse call numbers; hopefully this won't be true in future. Cutterless call numbers would sort ahead of those with an "A" in the subfield '\$b.' John wants to bring this proposed Cuttering policy to ACCM. In

situations where the Cutter in subfield \$b does not reflect the main entry, such as one that is geographic-based, perhaps the subfield \$b should be included. Valerie remarked that she always adds a full call number if a serial becomes an Integrating Resource in order to maintain continuity. Another situation where considerations of collocation might make a full call number advisable is simultaneous online and hard copy versions of the same work that are cataloged on separate records.

III. Announcements

John mentioned that Gary Strong will meet with the Collections and Technical Services Unit Heads on May 8. Next meetings of Catalogers Group are May 22nd and 29th. Topics may include a talk by Howard Batchelor on METS (Metadata Encoding & Transmission Standard), reports from CONSER/BIBCO Operations Committee meetings, the ILS selection, report on the Gary Strong meeting, CSB 98.