

Catalogers Group: Thursday, November 16, 2006

Present: Sharon Benamou, Valerie Bross (recorder), Chamy Kinsey, JaEun Ku, Toshie Marra, Caroline Miller (presenter), Louise Ratliff, John Riemer (presenter)

I. PCC Policy Committee Meeting November 2-3, 2006 (Caroline Miller):

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PoCoAgenda2006.pdf>

A. Strategic Directions:

1. SD5: Caroline headed the group looking at SD5: "Lead in the education and training of catalogers." Discussion topics included: (a) Developing training for communities beyond MARC21; (b) Delivery of digital services; (c) Training for RDA (already in development through an ALCTS module, under David Miller); (d) PCC certification for individuals. PCC certification would provide a mechanism for individuals rather than institutions to have PCC status. Considerations include: administrative issues of training and tracking; how to contribute NACO records; benefits to PCC of expanding cataloging community. Les Hawkins will be testing the concept of certification with Gene Dickerson, who recently moved to the State Department Library.
2. SD2: Redefine the common enterprise: Discussion topics included: NISO membership for PCC; expanding the community to vendors; globalization (the Virtual International Authority File; see more below).

B. ABA Reorganization (handouts distributed): Beacher Wiggins discussed reorganization of the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate. The proposal will go to LC administration at the end of November; by Sept. 30, 2007, the reorganization will be complete. 450 staff will move from their current work areas. The Music Cataloging Team will move out of ABA entirely—to the Music Division. To be determined: where in ABA should the Catalogers Learning Workshop live?

C. LC Advisory Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control: Beacher Wiggins reported on this group. The chair is Jose-Marie Griffiths; the group will include 3 ARL representatives; 3 ALA representatives; Bob Wolven (PCC); Lorcan Dempsey (OCLC); and representatives from Google and Microsoft. The task group is charged to answer the question, "Where do we go in the future with bibliographic services?" The task group met for the first time November 3rd. The group will have 3 issue-based meetings: (1) Focus on the user (Oakland, February 2007); (2) Metadata and infrastructure (Chicago, April 2007; organizers, Brian Schottlaender, Lorcan Dempsey, Clifford Lynch); (3) Economics of metadata (Washington, DC, June 2007).

D. In Brief

1. VIAF: Barbara Tillett discussed the Virtual International Authority File. IFLA is working with the Russian State Library to link a master file to the RSL geographic authority records with vernacular.
2. Non-Roman script guidelines: Charles Wilt discussed issues related to use of non-Roman script in bib records. Diana Brooking requested review of PCC practices in a letter to PoCo; there is also an ALCTS report http://www.ala.org/ala/alcts/newslinks/currentissues/nonenglishaccess/NonEnglishTF_fin_alreport_0918.pdf
3. SACO: Adam Schiff is completing a final pass of the revised manual (based on comments received); the second edition will be available before ALA Midwinter. An online training course is due out June 2007.

4. OCLC report: Glen Patton reported on the RLG/OCLC merger (the goal for completion is June 2007; non-duplicating RLIN records should be loaded into OCLC by the end of the year). For more information see: http://www.rlg.org/en/page.php?Page_ID=20965
5. OCLC has implemented a superseded records database with older versions of authority records

E. PoCo Decisions

1. Access level record (CONSER standard record): Regina Reynolds and Diane Boehr presented the final report to PoCo. Barbara Tillett expressed concern that the guidelines would be out of sync with RDA; but in the end, PoCo approved implementation. Implementation date: February 1, 2007.
2. Series: PCC will continue to support series authority work. PoCo will start a task group to examine streamlining series authority documentation. Glenn Patton suggested that public libraries and vendors be represented on the task group. Public library people were among the most concerned about the possible loss of series control, since many of the monographs acquired for these collections are sought by series (e.g., Harry Potter series). The proposal from UCLA of simplifying series coding by separating transcription (490 fields) and access (830 fields) met with mixed response. 14 libraries approved; 6 disapproved (for local ILS reasons).

Discussion of the implications of PCC certifications of individuals:

Could it help spread PCC expertise around when individuals take jobs at other institutions? When a critical mass of catalogers is certified, will they become routinely preferred in hiring and will this lead to pressure on most individuals to get certified? Will the demands of staying certified (continuing ed credits) lead to institutional funding support for that? For quality control and accountability, will catalogers use individual authorization numbers? Will quality control involve periodic sampling and/or rely on problem reporting?

II. Bibliographic Services Task Force (John Riemer):

- A. Single catalog: The task group has developed a list of “high-level specifications” for the ULs to take to OCLC. The ULs plan to meet with OCLC to find out whether OCLC would be able to serve as “Melvyl Plus.” The ULs’ consultation with OCLC is anticipated by the end of the year. If successful, a request will come back for developing more detailed specifications. Topics to discuss with OCLC include:
 1. Coverage: One third of the records in Melvyl are not represented in OCLC. Reasons: (a) SCP has used OCLC records for print to derive local e-resource monograph records; (b) Marcive and other vendors supply proprietary data not included in OCLC; (c) Santa Barbara & Berkeley have contributed records to RLIN rather than OCLC
 2. Holdings: UC needs a reliable, seamless link to circulation status with functionality to user-initiated services such as book renewal. Location information needs to be more specific than an OCLC institution holding symbol. Holdings data for multivolume titles needs to be included.
- B. “UC Cataloging as a Single Enterprise”: Heads of Technical Services have appointed a task group including reps from Berkeley & Irvine, as well as Toshie Marra and John Riemer from UCLA. A Japanese cataloger retired from UCSD; this opened consideration of a shared FTE for campuses needing cataloging for Japanese language materials. The task group is considering the challenges of how campuses could share an employee.
 1. Exchanges: A related question would be cataloging exchanges, where one library might have a subject/language specialist in one area (e.g., French); another library might have a

specialist in another area (e.g., German). If demand for the two language specialists' time was uneven, how would the funding work? What if campus A had 100 books for the French cataloger; but campus B only had 50 books for the German cataloger?

2. Stakeholders: When shared positions become vacant or frozen during budget crises, the priority-setting and decision-making may not be up to the host institution the way it is now.
3. Flexible postings: The cross-campus cataloger concept raises the idea that the posting could occur at the UC level, and the cataloger could live near any of the campuses.