

Catalogers Group
April 28, 2005
2:30-3:30
West Electronic (Media) Classroom

Attendees: Sharon Benamou, Valerie Bross, Beth Feinberg, Claudia Horning, Chamyia Kincy, Rhonda Lawrence, Sara Shatford Layne, Joan Flintoff LoPear, Janice Matthiesen, Caroline Miller, Nancy Norris (minutes), Louise Ratliff, John Riemer

Agenda

Discussion of *Draft Report of the Task Group on the PCC Mission Statement*
http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/PCC_mission-recs03-13-05-3.pdf

Caroline and Valerie will be in Washington, D.C. the first week in May attending the BIBCO and CONSER OpCos Joint Meeting and John wanted to know what the group thought about the assumptions included in the Task Group's draft report, as well as what they portended for the future of cataloging and the PCC.

Louise asked about the bullet beginning "Human intervention in cataloging..." Several people questioned the validity of the statement, not the least of which is whether there is any real change from the way things are currently being done.

Janice perceives a contradiction between the idea that catalogers should focus more on subject and authority work than on descriptive cataloging while suggesting, at the same time, a major focus on special collections' uncataloged material. Descriptive work in special collections cataloging, especially the provision of copy-specific information, helps prove ownership of rare and unique materials. She cited the Bloomberg theft case as an example. Sara said these issues go beyond just special collections materials. She said implementation of FRBR will make description more important.

Beth wondered what was meant by this division of the workload--LC's internal workflow?

Valerie asked about how the task force went about developing the assumptions list. What research was used; and were others outside the task force interviewed?

Rhonda thinks too much time (and money) is spent on low-use, low priority/esoteric items. She thinks catalogers should spend more time enhancing records that users actually need. Adding tables of contents may be of more value as long as the esoteric is provided with enough access points for interested researchers to find them.

Rhonda also felt two-way linkage relationships between different monographic versions should be expressed the way they are in integrating resource cataloging. There should be more earlier/later relationships expressed.

There was general discussion regarding what was meant about bullet #2 under PCC roles, "Continues to be involved in creating good cataloging and will continue to promote cost-effective solutions in a heterogeneous metadata environment"

What will the value of the OPAC be in the future? Will it become just a behind-the-scenes tool, or will it be Google-ized? What will be the relationship between “federated search engines” and the library catalog?

Rhonda felt the TG should be more explicit about standards. Beth asked whether the end users’ needs are being addressed. This should be part of the mission statement. Louise wanted them to specify who their community is: vendors, users, aggregators? Where is the assessment for customer satisfaction?

Will there be more or less need for catalogers? Probably we will be needed, but they work might change—not necessarily in all libraries, not necessarily always in libraries. For example, more catalogers might perform their work in vendor settings.

Caroline wondered what will be the implication for UCLA of Casalini’s (and other foreign vendors) providing BIBCO records in the future. What does “shelf-ready” mean for UCLA? We have to wait until this is implemented to properly assess.

Louise and Rhonda speculated on the future role of catalogers, who in future may be called Metadata Librarians who will apply different metadata schema to various digital projects, certainly not limited to MARC. Rhonda said catalogers might end up reviewing record loads and perhaps performing record enhancements and problem-solving. It will be easier to determine needs after the implementing use of these Vendor-enhanced records.

John summarized the discussion:

"We don't see that performance of the majority of routine cataloging by library assistants is any different from the current situation, unless it is allegedly going to become even more so. The assumption that description will lessen in importance does not seem true in the case of special collections material or other material that needs good identification and characterization. FRBRization of catalog records depends upon adequate description. Description will rise in importance as tangible materials are increasingly placed in remote storage.

"Human intervention will not only focus on unpublished materials but will also shift to less-widely-held published materials & lesser-known-language materials, as well as to enrichment of commercially-produced records for mainstream materials. Two-way relationships between records will become more common for monographs, as they are now for serials.

"An additional new role for the PCC will be helping to figure out how federated searching can/should work.

"More emphasis on assessment of the effectiveness of records and customer satisfaction is warranted in the proposed mission statement.

"We agree the PCC should expand to encompass both MARC and non-MARC metadata and that 'records' means those in online catalogs and those in separate files."

Adjourned at 3:30 p.m.