

Cataloging Group  
Minutes  
Feb. 10, 2005  
2:30-3:30 PM

Present: John Riemer, Sara Layne, Caroline Miller, Nancy Norris, Luiz Mendez, Valerie Bross, Sharon Benamou, Renée McBride, Janice Matthiesen, Gia Aivazian, Angela Riggio, Barbara Rudich, Hao Phan, Hermine Vermeij, Chamyia Kincy.

I. Reports of highlights from ALA Midwinter meeting in Boston.

**Caroline's report:**

Meetings attended:

PCC NACO/BIBCO Trainers; BIBCO-At-Large; PCC Participants meeting; PCC Standing Committee on Training meeting; Joint PCC SCT/CCS SAC Task Force on Library of Congress Classification Training meeting

Highlights from some of the meetings:

--PCC NACO/BIBCO Trainers:

- Anthony Franks has been appointed Team Leader of the Coop Team at LC. The Cataloging Directorate has been renamed the Bibliographic Access Division (BAD).
- NACO stats—FY2004 used 11 months of data; FY 2005 will be using 12 months
- There is now a push to define and use “access level” records for cataloging web resources.
- In March, Connexion 1.3 will be released. CJK and Arabic will be available in this release, as will all indexes. On May 1st Passport dies. On July 1st CJK, Arabic, and CatME die. RLG – RLIN21 Authorities Update – In-process authority records in the new RLIN21 system will now expire after a fixed period of 60-90 days.
- The SCCTP IR course is currently being revised according to the newly edited IR module.
- BIBCO Training Manual is now available for use by trainers. NACO Participants' Manual: the PCC Steering Committee wants the updating of the NPM to take place within the Coop Team at LC. The projected date for its completion is May/June 2005.
- All the latest PCC training documentation is available on the training website including the new BIBCO Training Manual and the new Series training documentation. If you are doing any in-house training please feel free to use these but let Carolyn Sturtevant know for LC's statistics.

- NACO Normalization rules questions (Robert Bremer, OCLC) – is it time to revisit them within the context of new systems? The treatment of various characters that act as words (i.e. \$, @) is different within different systems.

--BIBCO-at-Large:

- Emphasis on training, better communications
- The BIBCO Training Manual is now available with a password to trainers. The authority training course will be offered in Chicago. The course materials will be available in fall of 2005.
- For the NACO Participants' Manual, Anthony Franks will be setting up assignments. It is supposed to come out in May/June 2005. March 14-18 there will be NACO training for PCC member libraries at LC. A series training course will be set up for fall of 2005.
- SACO Program: session to orient SACO mentors at ALA, June 24, 2005. There is a possibility of getting LC Classification proposals into a web form.
- Issues suggested from BIBCO members – Is it time to update NACO normalization rules?

#### **Valerie's report:**

Valerie attended many meetings on cataloging E-resources, ISSN, and CONSER issues. Highlights from some of her meetings:

--ISSN: Regina Reynolds gave several presentations on this topic, including a full review at "Codified Innovations: Data Standards and Their Useful Applications"; and brief summaries at the LITA Standards Interest Group; CONSER at Large; and the Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee Discussion Group. The tentative proposal favored now among Working Group 5 members is to retain current definitions for ISSN, but to designate "tISSN" as a format-neutral identifier.

--CONSER-at-Large: chief topic was LC's new copy cataloging process (042 lccopycat). Members expressed concern about the LC's procedure for introducing this new level of cataloging; what it represented (an internal process v. a new standard); the effect on the CONSER database; and technical details.

--AACR3 was also a matter of some attention at CONSER-at-Large, at the Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee, and at OLAC CAPC.

#### **Angela's report:**

Highlights from some of the meetings that Angela attended:

--"OCLC Focus Group on Managing Electronic Serials Collections": OCLC is exploring possible e-serial services. It would involve OCLC managing libraries' e-holdings in WorldCat, potentially to the article level. WorldCat would serve as a Global Knowledge

Base, searchable through Google interface. Also thinking about a MARC record service, this would automatically update holdings and deliver to libraries.

--“ALCTS E-Resources Interest Group: Electronic Resource Management from the Field, Innovative, Ex Libris”: Discussed the workflow for electronic resources and provided a live demonstration on TrackER (Tracking Electronic Resources), LC’s online traffic manager for recommending, selecting and tracking the remote-access electronic resources that are in the processing work stream. LC is willing to provide this software, but needs to know about the demand for this product. UCLA has not used this software yet. For additional information on TrackER, please see:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/TrackERALA2004.ppt>

The speakers:

Tony Harvell (UC San Diego) discussed UC San Diego's implementation of Innovative Interfaces ERMS. Ivy Anderson (Harvard) and Ellen Finnie Duranceau (MIT) focused on their experience partnering with Ex Libris to bring out Verde (Ex Libris ERMS), including their involvement with the development of the Verde functional specifications, data elements, data models, and screen design, as well as the relationship to the Digital Library Federation Electronic Resources Management Initiative (DLF ERMI) Project.

--“The Role of the Academic Professional in Technical Services Discussion Group”: Discussed about the changing role of professional—seems most librarians are delegating work to LAs and taking on more administrative roles, etc.

### **Luiz’s report:**

Highlights from some of the meetings that Luiz attended:

--ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group: “CIP Records, To Upgrade Or Not To Upgrade--How Libraries Deal With CIP Records”:

- CIP Program Chief, John Celli, announced that the Program must develop a strategic plan in the next two years: Do we need it? And how is it going to be? In order to accomplish this, a CIP survey will be developed based on three clusters: (1) Eligibility of scope: format, types of publications, (2) Data: additional data elements; use of access record instead; enrichment of records/data; inclusion of TOC, jacket images, etc. (3) Product: do we need CIP data in the book?; should additional mechanisms of record distribution be set up (MARC and XML).
- UKM Records: Beware of the problems with pagination in UKM records—which is based on CIP data and it is usually different than final book pagination. As per OCLC’s request, do not create separate records based on this difference!

--ALCTS Catalog Management Discussion Group: “Duplicate Record Detection and Resolution in a Consortium”: Integrity of the online catalog (for a clean database, free of redundancy!), presenters focused on:

- Causes for duplicate records; cost of de-duping; efficient resolution procedures for duplicate detection; challenges in searching for duplicates (improper searching techniques; difficulty caused by typos).
- deduping algorithms: numerical vs. non-numerical deduping algorithms
- problems caused by duplicate records and resolution as illustrated by University of Maryland recent merger of 16 databases (catalogs) into one single catalog upon migration to ALEPH
- OCLC Quality Control: Duplicate Detection Program which runs once or twice a year is now on hold and was last run 3 years ago. It will resume once they move to ORACLE. Requests submitted by libraries continue to be processed by OCLC. Other developments by OCLC in this area: global authority control system via Connexion.

--ALCTS Discussion Group: “The Role of the Professional in Academic Library Technical Services”:

- Serials vs. Acquisitions merger
- Integrated Workflows (use of vendor records; cataloging performed by Acq vs. Cataloging Dept.)
- Proportion of professional vs. paraprofessional staff
- Issues related to de-professionalization of cataloging
- Roles of the Professional: Systems experts, Training & Documentation, Managers
- In sum, reorganization of Technical Services

--ALCTS Continuing Resources Discussion Group:

- Updates on AACR3
- “Cataloging of Integrating Resources” (Judy Kuhagen): overview of procedures for cataloging IRs. Presented “access level records” as an alternative option for cataloging IRs where the focus is on subject analysis rather than on description, which would include only a minimal number of data elements.
- “Serials: FRBR and Beyond” (Barbara Tillett): provided an account of serials within the FRBR model by proposing “Expression Level Authority Records” (one record rather than successive records)

--Spectrum Scholars Interest Group:

- ACRL will establish “Mentor Program” for Spectrum Scholars. Final decision on the program, recruitment of librarians (including past Spectrum Scholars) to participate in the program will be made at ACRL Annual meeting this year. PLA (Public Library Association) has also become a partner with the Spectrum Initiative to develop its Mentor Program.

### **John’s report:**

John spent much of his time at Midwinter trying to find out a maximum of information about what the new Google initiatives mean for the Library and for cataloging units.

This is hard, given that Google spokespeople don't want to give away any competitive advantage, and that staff at the libraries involved in the Google digitization projects have been required to sign non-disclosure agreements.

He attended a presentation by Adam Smith, Senior Business Product Manager at Google, made at the ACRL E-Text Centers DG. The room was packed, and the chair broke the 2-hour time slot down into two or three repeated mini-sessions, to respond to the demand.

What is the level of scanning? Initially just images, later at least "dirty OCR." Cleaned up (proofread) OCR might be provided significantly later.

Extent of foreign language scope? English emphasis at first; other languages probably later.

What about persistence of content? "We are investing resources and are interested in protecting that investment."

Persistence of URLs? "Working with Cross Ref."

Is scanning being done on or offsite? Google wouldn't say. Stanford's books are being taken to Google headquarters for scanning.

Is the scope just monographs? Google wouldn't say, but an audience member volunteered that Michigan is going down the shelf, taking both monographs and serials, skipping over added copies.

I learned later that books that might be damaged in scanning are set aside. So, the "Google rejects" amount to a preservation-needs inventory. The \$100,000 scanners involve a book sitting face up in a cradle with wind-blown turning of pages. Oversize books and serials, as well as single-sheet maps and nonbook materials are not being included. So "all the volumes" in Stanford and Michigan libraries are *not* being included.

Are the cataloging records being collected for the material? Yes.

For what purpose(s)? To present concise citation information in Google search results, and "other internal purposes."

Google Scholar offers limited "Author" searching as only alternative to general keyword searching. Also, John didn't get any sense that Google would be offering ability to search for books at the summary, whole-document level. We may only be offered indexing at the full-text level.

When will we see the initial results? At least 10,000 are already available in Google. Suggested search is "books" or "books about" at beginning of search argument.

The value-added roles libraries play in integrating all types of materials in all subjects and languages and time periods, organizing them for multiple types of retrieval

still seem distinct from what Google will be able to offer. We could look at what Google is doing as positive, something that complements our activities.

(Michigan tells me they are systematically cloning print records in the online catalog to create records for the e-versions they are getting from Google's scanning.

## II. Announcements

None