

PCC Policy Committee Meeting November 6—7, 2008
Nov. 6 Jefferson Building LJ 113, Nov. 7 Madison Building Montpelier Room

November 6, 2007 9:00—5:00 Jefferson Building LJ 113

8:30-9:00 Coffee

9:00-9:15 Welcome and Introductions [D. Banush, 15 minutes]

9:15-10:00 RDA Update and Testing: (B. Wiggins, Barbara Tillett)
a) Status of RDA development
b) Status of RDA testing by LC, NLM, and NAL [Document 1](#)
c) Work of Joint LC/PCC LCRI/RDA Task Force

10:00-10:15 Task Force status reports
PCC Task Group on the Internationalization of Authority Files (Joan Schuitema)

BREAK 10:15—10:30 [15 minutes]

10:30-10:45 Task Force status reports continued
Report from the Provider-Neutral Monograph Record Group

[Document 2](#): External Link to the Final Report [PDF: 853 KB / 20 p.] (C. Sturtevant, L. Hawkins)

10:45-12:00 BIBCO record requirements: BIBCO "core" as the BIBCO "floor"

[Document 3](#): BIBCO Record Requirements: Re-thinking the Status Quo
(Banush, Sturtevant, Hawkins)

12:00-1:00 Lunch

1:00-3:00 Changing roles for the PCC

- a) **PCC series policy** (Banush, all) Remaining questions, requirements, series options and new series coding, tasks of updating documentation,
- b) **Assessment of PCC efforts:** We focus on record output now, how can we move to measuring outcomes? As a measure of PCC outcomes, what is the impact of training on accuracy and spread of cataloging knowledge? (Cannan and Banush)
- c) **PCC decision making process:** focus on developing guidelines, principles, that are needed for future decisions, the work of task groups, consultation, etc. (Banush, all)

BREAK 3:00-3:30

3:30-5:00 Reporting

- OCLC Update [Cynthia Whitacre 10 minutes]
- LC Secretariat [J. Cannan]
- [Document 4](#) NACO/BIBCO [C. Sturtevant 5 minutes]
- [Document 5](#) PCC Statistical Report
- [Document 6](#) SACO [J. Mitchell 5 minutes]
- [Document 7](#) CONSER [L. Hawkins 5 minutes]
- [Document 8](#) IFLA Report [D. Miller, J. Mitchell 10 minutes]
- **Reports of the Standing Committees and Discussion of Revised Mission Statements**
- [Document 9](#) Standing Committee on Automation [A. Tarango]
- [Document 10](#) Standing Committee on Standards [J. Schuitema]
- Standing Committee on Training [R. Uhl]
- [Document 11](#) Revised Mission Statements of the Standing Committees

PCC Policy Committee Meeting

November 6—7, 2008

Friday November 7, 8:30—12:00 Madison Building Montpelier Room 6th Floor

8:30—9:00 Coffee

9:00-9:10 Related New Business, if any [PoCo Members, 10 minutes]

9:10-10:30 How can the PoCo become more engaged with the future directions of the PCC?

- a) Karen Calhoun is meeting in December 2008 at OCLC with members of the Steering Committee and Secretariat to discuss areas of mutual concern and possible collaboration.

Task for PoCo: Please help identify two or three areas from the strategic plan that would be most fruitful to pursue

Resources:

New OCLC projects described in recent issues of [OCLC Abstracts](#)

[Document 12:](#) Strategic plan items that require action

[Document 13:](#) Issues extracted from *On the Record* and LC's reply

For further information (you don't need to print these out):

Link to the full list of PCC Strategic Directions and Details

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stratdir-2008.html>

Break 10:30—10:45 [15 minutes]

10:45-12:00

Strategic Directions Discussion Continued

PCC Participants' Meeting Agenda, ALA Midwinter 2008 [D. Banush]

Election of Chair Elect [D. Banush]

Wrap-Up [D. Banush, 15 minutes]

Adjournment 12:00

Meeting Locations:

On Thursday November 6th we will meet in room LJ113 in the Thomas Jefferson Building
1st Street SE, between Independence Avenue and East Capitol Street

A map of the first floor is available from: http://www.loc.gov/visit/maps/jefferson_1.html

On Friday November 7th we will meet in the Montpelier Room in the Madison Building
6th floor, room number LM 619 A map of the 6th floor is available from:

http://www.loc.gov/visit/maps/madison_6.html

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

**PCC Volunteers for Testing of RDA
October 23, 2008**

On September 23 we issued an invitation to volunteer to test RDA. It was sent to the PCC Training discussion list, aimed at NACO and BIBCO trainers, reviewers, and NACO Funnel Coordinators. The message asked for name, contact information, funnel involvement, types of materials, and any other experience. Six people responded, representing five institutions. The sixth institution volunteered prior to our call for testers.

If other participants should be recruited, we could repeat the call on a list that reaches a wider audience.

Six institutions replied:

- 1. University of Washington Libraries—2 participants**
- 2. San Jose State University**
- 3. Brigham Young University**
- 4. University of Chicago Library**
- 5. University of North Dakota
Leader of North Dakota funnel**
- 6. Douglas County Libraries**

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

Document 3

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

BIBCO Record Requirements: Re-thinking the Status Quo

Since its inception, the BIBCO program has entered two types of record for monographic resources: a core record, with a baseline of subject analysis (where needed), classification, and authority controlled headings; and a full record, which contains more detailed notes and deeper subject analysis. While training materials and supporting documentation are filled with extensive examples of records done at both the core and full levels, the line between the two has not always been clear. Indeed, many libraries have contributed records coded as core that could be accurately described as full. Others have rejected the creation of core records altogether, while still others have made the core record their *de facto* standard, although the encoding levels and the actual content of the records may appear incongruous.

One reason behind the recent PCC series tracing decision was the simplification of record requirements. A more flexible approach to series treatments could broaden program participation, particularly from potential partners outside the US and Canada, and result in increased contributions. That reasoning has raised other questions about how BIBCO might further streamline its record structure. One suggested approach is the establishment of a BIBCO standard record, akin to the recently-developed CONSER standard record that has gained acceptance by many serials catalogers. A BIBCO standard record would become the new baseline record for the program. The fluid and often artificial distinctions between “core” and “full” would be eliminated. Instead, any record meeting the basic standards could be authenticated as a BIBCO record. Catalogers would retain the option of adding to the basic record as their institutional policies and needs dictate, but such augmentation would not be required. Thus while a standard record may (for example) make series tracings optional, any BIBCO library could continue to trace series on its records or add a greater array of subject headings and still meet the standard record requirements. BIBCO training and documentation would be greatly simplified as well. Such changes could make the program more attractive to potential members. A new standard record may also assist third-party vendors in creating catalog records for purchase.

Some questions for the Policy Committee to explore in contemplating such a change:

- Would PoCo endorse the principle of replacing the core and full records with a single standard record?
- If so, would PoCo support the creation of a task group to develop the criteria for such a record and plan for implementation, including communication strategies and updates to documentation?
- If PoCo does not endorse the principle, would members support another approach? What would that approach look like?
- In what timeframe should a decision be made?
- What is a reasonable timeframe for the development of record requirements and for implementation?
- Are there other issues to consider?

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

NACO Annual Report, FY2008

The continued growth of the NACO program marks the success of this year. In FY2008, forty-six new institutions joined NACO, eight as separate members and thirty-eight with membership in funnel groups. Two regional funnel projects, Texas and Michigan, are new this year.

Record Contributions

The Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) has been very active during FY2008. Member institutions contributed 200,868 new name authority records, an increase of 6.67% over FY2007. PCC members created 12,536 new series authority records, an increase of 19.79% over FY2007. OCLC ongoing cleanup projects to remove ending punctuation marks from headings and to add non-Latin references from bibliographic records to existing name authority records caused the statistics for changes to name and series authority records to skyrocket to new highs in FY2008. Name authority changes numbered 473,241, an increase of 665.35% over FY2007, and series authority changes numbered 30,372, an increase of 670.86% over the previous fiscal year.

Training Activity

In FY2008, PCC trainers provided participants from ninety-nine institutions with some NACO training. Forty-six of these institutions were new NACO members and fifty-three were existing members that received various levels of NACO training.

NACO trainers around the country conducted the basic five day NACO Workshop. Staff members from the Cooperative Cataloging Team and the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate, in addition to traveling to conduct NACO Workshops, held three simultaneous classroom sessions in Washington, DC in September 2008 to meet pent up demand for NACO training. The CJK NACO Project attracted twenty-two participants to a two-day advanced training session on Corporate Names.

After a Train the Trainer Series session for five participants in early Spring, LC hosted PCC NACO Series training in May 2008 for catalogers around the country. There were twelve participants from eight different institutions.

Training activity numbers:

New NACO institutions:	8
Existing NACO institutions:	20
New NACO funnel members:	38
Current members--CJK Adv. NACO Corp Name Trng:	22
Current NACO institutions—PCC Series:	8

Document 4 NACO/BIBCO Report

Total new institutions trained in FY2008:	46
Total current institutions trained in FY2008:	50
Funnels receiving new members:	10
Funnels that are new to NACO:	2

The success of NACO training and review is due to the commitment and talents of professionals throughout the PCC community who accept invitations to mentor newer NACO contributors. With the retirements of several valuable NACO instructors, the Coop Team hopes to expand the NACO trainer ranks through offering in FY2009 a Train the NACO Trainer session.

Training Materials

LC Coop Team members maintain the NACO training materials, incorporating suggestions from all NACO trainers and from NACO evaluations. The Coop Team reviewed and updated the five day NACO Workshop and related web based training materials throughout the year. NACO member institutions and trainers may request instructions from the Coop Team for downloading the training files from an online source.

Judy Knop, Funnel Coordinator for the ATLA NACO Project, developed a slide presentation “Authority Control for Personal Names in Religion: Tutorial”, available at the [ATLA Technical Services web site](#).

Policy

OCLC began adding non-Latin script headings from bibliographic records to existing name authority records. PCC NACO participants may add non-Latin references only to new personal and corporate name authority records, or to existing name authority records that OCLC has already processed, in this phase of the project.

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

BIBCO Annual Report FY2008

October 17, 2008

In FY 2008, BIBCO partner institutions contributed 76,572 new bibliographic records, an increase of 16% over FY2007. Many participants pledge to send more records next year and deserve high praise for their dedication. It is hard to quantify the contributions of time and energy by BIBCO Contacts, Representatives, and task group members, or the benefits accrued from this work to the national and international library community.

BIBCO membership has remained steady. The BIBCO training materials are currently being revised by a working group of the Standing Committee on Training. The release of these materials in early FY2009 is likely to stimulate training activity among current and prospective members. One BIBCO institution reported that they conducted BIBCO training internally in FY2008, and many others arranged or attended training for SACO, NACO, and NACO series. It is encouraging to read of new hires being prepared for BIBCO cataloging even though several institutions reported staff losses due to retirements and funding constraints.

The language coverage noted in BIBCO reports this year are worthy of the United Nations. One participant lists UN documents as a collection they include in their BIBCO work. The expansion of Enhance and BIBCO work to different formats accounts for increased BIBCO production at many libraries. Digital collections are becoming more important in many narrative reports, and a few mention converting traditional cataloger titles into "Metadata" positions.

The BIBCO Operations Committee meeting in May 2008 had reports from two new task groups. One will create Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets to add non-Latin data to bibliographic records. The other, the Provider-Neutral Monograph Task Force, is refining practices to reduce the proliferation of duplicate records in OCLC for monographs that appear both as individual print items and in multiple aggregator packages of electronic files. Cynthia Whitacre solicited ideas from OpCo participants about enhance and enrichment capabilities in OCLC. After the announcement of a PCC policy on series in August 2008, the topic of record updates resurfaced in the form of a serious discussion of BIBCO core and full level records. Talk of the usefulness of minimal level or BIBCO standard records as possible alternatives also surfaced in the PPC discussion list.

References to automated tools for cataloging are mentioned in the narratives from some BIBCO members. OCLC began using non-Latin characters from bib records to create selected fields in name authority records in July 2008. One library cites the use of vendor-supplied post-cataloging series authority records. The trend toward new types of materials and new methods of providing access continues, and provides a challenge for the BIBCO program.

Document 4 NACO/BIBCO Report

With permission from the contributor Sherman Clarke, here's a quote to stimulate thinking in the coming year:

We collectively need to have a model that allows us to do some of the building of BIBCO records mechanically or through accretion of metadata from institutional records or other record loads. OCLC already does considerable building of the master record from incoming records; what we need is something more like the metadata that is becoming usual in NewGen environments. If someone adds a tag or review or picture, that becomes available in the master cluster. Not a BIBCO record, but a BIBCO cloud of metadata for a particular manifestation of a work/expression.

Compiled by Carolyn Sturtevant

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

**LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access
Program for Cooperative Cataloging Statistics -- NACO/BIBCO/CONSER/SACO**

Annual Compilation FY2008 (October 1, 2007 - Sept 30 2008)

TOTAL SUMMARY STATISTICS

Category	Total FY2008	FY2008 as % of FY2007	FY2007	TOTAL PCC TO DATE
Bibliographic Records (BIBCO)	76,572	116.13%	65,939	940,587
Bibliographic Record Changes (BIBCO)	6,252	118.63%	5,270	127,428
New Name Authority Records (NACO)	200,868	106.67%	188,316	3,033,379
Name Authority Record Changes (NACO)	473,241	765.35%	61,833	768,624
New Series Authorities (NACO)	12,536	119.79%	10,465	160,320
Series Authorities Changes (NACO)	30,372	770.86%	3,940	44,015
New Subject Authority Records (SACO)	3,116	102.26%	3,047	46,177
Subject Authority Record Changes (SACO)	1,125	196.34%	573	11,128
New Class Numbers (SACO)	1,326	59.95%	2,212	24,523
Class Number Changes (SACO)	2	100.00%	2	630
Authentications (CONSER)	25,096	112.45%	22,317	1,136,370
Maintenance (CONSER)	32,902	106.06%	31,023	177,598

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

**SACO Report to the PCC Policy Committee
Annual PoCo Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

Growth of the SACO Program

The SACO Program continues to increase membership at nearly the rate of one new participant each month. Most encouraging is the news that 50% of the growth stems from institutions which have supported staff participation in the *LCSH* and LCC courses. The workshop attendees have in-turn returned to convince administrations to join the SACO Program.

New members and funnels include:

Asbury Park Public Library [NjAs] – Oct. 31, 2007
Regent University [VaVbRU] – Nov. 20, 2007: Virginia SACO Funnel
Georgian Court University [NjLakG] – Dec. 6, 2007: NJ NACO Funnel
University of Hartford [CtWeHarU] – Dec. 21, 2007
Pierpont Morgan Library [NNPM] – Feb. 15, 2008: Art SACO Funnel
U.S. Army Community & Support Library [ViAIACF] – Feb. 15, 2008
Donald F. and Mildred Topper Othmer Library of Chemical History [PaPhCHF] –
May 6, 2008
University of Wisconsin, School of Library and Information Studies [WU-LS] – May
22, 2008
Northwestern University Transportation Library [IEN-Tr] – September 22, 2008
Colorado Subject Authority Funnel Project – September 22, 2008 – includes 4 new
members

International expansion (IFLA)

The PCC sponsored a poster session during the 2008 IFLA Conference in Québec City and was represented by David Miller, the SACO representative to the PoCo, and John Mitchell, Cooperative Programs staff member. This event offered a unique opportunity to meet with attendees and respond to questions posed by an international audience. The PCC has pursued the goal of increased world-wide participation and SACO has often been the first component program in which membership has been sought.

Liaison from SACO to the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)

In SAC's quinquennial review of its charge, SAC realized that there is great potential in its collaboration with the PCC and requested that the ALCTS CCS Executive Board amend the SAC charge to allow for a non-voting member-liaison from the PCC/SACO to SAC. ALCTS/CCS Executive Board approved the recommendation at ALA Annual in Anaheim, June 2008.

Genre/Form Pilot Project

The Library of Congress has begun a pilot project to accept genre/form subject headings for inclusion in *LCSH* using the SACO program as the conduit. The University of Washington and Brigham Young University are participating. This is limited to headings in the areas of radio/television programs and moving images. The ALA/ALCTS/CCS Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation has encouraged participation in creating new genre/form proposals and has created a listserv as a forum for open discussion. Interested participants are invited to subscribe to the list by visiting the [Genre/Form Implementation listserv](#) web site.

Validation records

Subject authority records are continuing to be created for valid subject strings obtained from bibliographic records. The validation record project was begun in May 2007. These records are not printed in the annual editions of *LCSH* (the “red books”), and can be identified by the legend “[proposed validation record]” appearing at the end of the 1xx string which is removed once the records have been approved and distributed. Each record contains a 667 field with the data: “Record generated for validation purposes.” Current policy remains in place that SACO participants, if, in the process of submitting a proposal to change an existing heading or subdivision should encounter a validation record that includes the heading or subdivision being changed, no proposal to update the validation record should be contributed. Instead, the SACO participant should contact the Cooperative Programs Section liaison to report the desired change. It remains the responsibility of the Coop staff member to alert the Policy and Standards Division staff of the need for a validation record revision.

Vernacular data in subject authority records

In response to questions from SACO participants, LC has no plans at this time to add non-Latin script data to *LCSH* subject authority records, although Library of Congress classification records do already contain non-Latin script data in Chinese, Arabic, Hebrew, Cyrillic, and Greek.

The Policy and Standards Division has created a “frequently asked questions” Web document accessible at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/nonlatinfaq.html> which contains more detailed information about vernacular data in authority records.

SACO Processing – Improvements in “through-put” time

The Library Services strategic plan includes a target that, within the next three years, 90% of new SACO proposals be reviewed and forwarded to the Policy and Standards Division within seven days of receipt.

Document 6

The Coop Section introduced a new SACO workflow to address new proposals for LCSH. Proposals are now downloaded daily by the technician or surrogate. After downloading, the team records the record control number with the code of the cataloger responsible for that proposal. These proposals are initially examined by a Coop Section member to sort out the proposals that are obviously inappropriate for LCSH. The Section member performing this initial review immediately revises and sends to PSD any proposal that can be so treated.

This means that someone can input into the web form a proposal for a new LCSH heading on Monday and on Wednesday see in the online LC authorities database from the transaction date and 019 field that the Team downloaded, reviewed, and sent the proposal to PSD on Tuesday—one day after inputting to the web form.

Team members downloaded 3,492 proposals for new LCSH. They deleted about 300 of these for a number of reasons. Some were input by “web crawlers”, others had MARC21 errors sufficiently serious that the proposal could not be processed, and others were irrelevant to LCSH.

In August and September of 2008, 16% of the proposals input into the web form could not be downloaded for review for the reasons mentioned in the paragraph above. Of the records distributed for review, a 10% were not sent forward to PSD. Of the remaining 74% proposals, PSD approved 96% of those proposals for inclusion into LCSH. Slightly less than 2% were “Re-Submit”, meaning that the SACO participant could return the proposal after further work. The remaining 2% were not approved.

Training and documentation update

Effective with FY2009 (Oct. 1, 2008) all training documentation on the Cataloger’s Learning Workshop (CLW) is freely available. Additionally the CLW Homepage (<http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/>) underwent a re-design as the responsibility for content and maintenance shifted to the Cooperative Programs and Instructional Division (COIN).

The “Basic Subject Cataloging Using *LCSH*” training materials were updated and the latest version is available on the CLW Homepage as are the “Fundamentals of LC Classification” course materials.

Members of the Cooperative Programs Section conducted each of these workshops eight times over the past fiscal year for 113 attendees from 56 institutions.

Document 6

Presentations of LCSH Workshop

Oct. 2007	OCLC Palinet (Philadelphia)	Mitchell
Nov. 2007	Nelinet/OCLC Eastern (Hartford)	Mitchell
April 2008	OCLC Eastern (D.C.)	Mitchell, Frank
July 2008	Library of Congress	Mitchell, Frank
Sept. 2008	OCLC Eastern (D.C.)	Mitchell, Frank

Presentations of LCC Workshop

Nov. 2007	OCLC Eastern (D.C.)	Frank, Mitchell
May 2008	OCLC Eastern (D.C.)	Frank, Mitchell
Sept. 2008	OCLC Solinet (Atlanta)	Frank, Mitchell

SACO-At-Large

SACO-At-Large will be held in conjunction with the other PCC-At-Large meetings in order to broaden the PCC audience for the subject-related presentations. The January meeting will be in the same 11:00 a.m. to Noon time slot.

The ALA Midwinter Conference in Denver will feature a presentation on FRSAR, while the annual conference in Chicago will be a program with a panel discussion of subject issues stemming from the implementation of RDA.

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

2008 CONSER Report

CONSER celebrated its 35th year during the CONSER Operations Representatives Meeting in May and marked several other milestones throughout 2008.

Several member institutions continue to be understaffed and have experienced budget reductions due to the nation's weak economy over the past year. Despite these difficulties, members made significant contributions to the CONSER database. The number of new records 25,096 represented a 12% increase over last year and the 31,023 record maintenance transactions was a 6% over last year. Representatives also made contributions by serving on various PCC task groups and as trainers for PCC training programs.

CONSER Membership

One new associate level member joined CONSER in 2008, the Getty Research Institute (Los Angeles, California). The Getty Research Library's collections further the knowledge and understanding of the visual arts with many rare materials and digital resources. We look forward to the contributions Getty Research Library will make to CONSER.

The University of California Libraries (UC) CONSER Funnel celebrated its second year in 2008 and continued efforts to train and mentor staff at participating UC campuses. Funnel members Sarah Gardner (University of California, Davis), Melissa Beck (UCLA) and Valerie Bross (UCLA) presented a North American Serials Interest Group presentation on how funnel membership works for the UC campuses and how it might be a model for others wishing to join CONSER using a funnel structure. Funnel members developed a proposal to expand the funnel to include libraries in California not part of the UC system. The structure, documentation and other resources assembled by the UC CONSER Funnel provide a good basis for other groups interested in forming a CONSER funnel.

University of Nebraska was granted CONSER authorization as a part of the National Digital Newspaper Project (NDNP), the first of several NDNP institutions expected to receive CONSER authorization. The project builds on the CONSER authenticated records created by the United States Newspaper Program (USNP). As USNP microforms are digitized by NDNP member institutions, corresponding CONSER authenticated records are updated and submitted to NDNP as the primary metadata for the digitized newspapers.

There was interest in the ongoing individual member level being piloted by Gene Dickerson (Department of State), as several CONSER operations representatives have moved from CONSER to non-CONSER institutions. Formal agreements between the institution, the individual, and OCLC are needed before this experiment can be expanded. These agreements will be in place in early fiscal year 2009.

Document 7

CONSER Standard Record (CSR)

In June 2007 when CONSER implemented the CSR, representatives unanimously agreed to revisit the standard in one year to monitor its efficiency and make any necessary adjustments. In 2008 the CONSER Standard Record Monitoring Group was formed to gather feedback on any adjustments that were needed. The feedback was vetted and presented at the CONSER Operations Meeting in May 2008. As a result, several clarifications and minor changes in practice were suggested. The group was co-chaired by Liping Song (Health Sciences Library System University of Pittsburgh) and Beth Thornton (University of Georgia) and included participation from other CONSER institutions including: Renette Davis (U. of Chicago), Sophie Dong (U. of Georgia), Gene Dickerson (Dept. of State), Beth Guay (U. of Maryland), Miranda Hay (NLM), Elmer Klebs (LC), Iliana Mitropolitsky (LC), Robert Rendall (Columbia U.), Regina Reynolds (LC), and Steve Shadle (U. of Washington).

Most CONSER libraries have fully implemented or incorporated useful aspects of the CSR into their serials cataloging with few problems reported during their first full year of working with the new guidelines. Catalogers from several non-CONSER libraries have also expressed interest in using the standard, have attended SCCTP sessions on the CSR, and reported using the standard on various cataloging related listservs.

Serials Cooperative Cataloging Training Program (SCCTP)

The Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP) celebrated its 10th anniversary with a presentation given by Laura Kimberly, Associate Director and Manager of Continuing Education Services at Amigos, at the CONSER At-Large during ALA Annual . Kimberly's remarks focused on the SCCTP's collaboration with Amigos in converting and delivering workshop material in the live online environment.

Frieda Rosenberg (UNC Chapel Hill) and Margi Mann (OCLC Western) completed the revision of the Serial Holdings Workshop in February of 2008. Wen-Ying Lu (Michigan State University) and Margi Mann (OCLC) completed the conversion of the Serial Holdings Workshop for live-online delivery in September 2008.

Several workshops were revised to incorporate the CSR guidelines:

The Basic Serials Cataloging Workshop was revised by Melissa Beck, Valerie Bross, and Peter Fletcher (UCLA). Hien Nguyen (LC) coordinated a Basic Serials Cataloging Trainers Refresher Workshop in conjunction with ALA Annual in June 2008.

Linda Gonzalez, BCR Member Services Librarian revised the Electronic Serials Cataloging Workshop

Over thirty SCCTP workshops were given during the past fiscal year hosted by a variety of institutional workshop sponsors and reached nearly 300 trainees.

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

IFLA Report to the PCC

submitted by John N. Mitchell

The opportunity to attend the World Library and Information Congress 2008 and the 74th IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) General Conference and Council grew out of a query about the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) by the Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval in Québec.

At the same time that the discussions between the Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval and the Cooperative Cataloging Team were being held, the PCC Steering Committee was trying to decide whether to authorize the involvement of the PCC in IFLA by sponsoring a “poster session”. Rebecca Mugridge, current PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) Chair and David Miller, the SACO Representative to the PoCo were to serve as PCC ambassadors. The proximity of the 2008 IFLA conference venue to the U.S. encouraged a PCC presence and weighed heavily, along with the financial considerations, in the decision to support having a poster. PCC’s involvement could be justified by referencing its fourth strategic direction of the PCC to pursue globalization, which originated in the recommendations of the Joint Task Force on International Participation in the PCC.

Through unforeseen circumstances, the Policy Committee Chair was unable to attend and David Miller expressed concern that he would need to cover the PCC “poster session” solo. Given these factors, and in spite of the cancellation of the post-IFLA training, I made a personal commitment to attend IFLA and offered to assist in providing coverage for the exhibit.

During the time the exhibits were manned we entertained numerous queries about the Program and distributed approximately 50 PCC brochures. PCC brochures were distributed to members of the Cataloguing Standing Committee as well, during its second meeting. In spite of the Francophone location, the “lingua franca” was assuredly English. Nevertheless, many in attendance were multilingual and we were approached in a variety of languages. We were able to present a comprehensive PCC picture such that “follow-ups” should be expected. Serious expressions of interest to join at least one of the constituent programs of the PCC were received from the following six institutions:

1) Swiss National Library

SACO

Contacts: Genevieve Clavel-Merrin
National and International Cooperation
Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA
Swiss Federal Office of Culture FOC
CH-3003 Bern
Hallwylstrasse 15
Telephone: + 41 31 322 89 36
Fax: + 41 31 322 84 63
Email: genevieve.clavel@nb.admin.ch
Website: www.nb.admin.ch

Document 8

and
Patrice Landry
Responsable Indexation matières
Department fédéral de l'intérieur DFI
Office fédéral de la culture OFC
Bibliothèque national Suisse BN
CH-3003 Bern
Hallwylstrasse 15
Telephone: + 41 31 324 06 25
Fax: + 41 31 322 84 63
Email: patrice.landry@nb.admin.ch

2) Université du Québec à Montréal SACO
Contact: Benoît Bilodeau
(Author of: RASUQAM: The thesaurus of “descriptors” from the
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM))
Bibliothécaire, Service de l'analyse documentaire - Services
techniques
Service des bibliothèques
Case postale 8889, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P3
Telephone: 514.987.3000, ext. 3998
Fax: 514.987.0285
Email: bilodeau.benoit@uqam.ca

3) Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval SACO
Contact: Jo-Anne Bélair
Chef Section du Répertoire de vedettes-matière (RVM)
Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval
Pavillon Jean-Charles-Bonenfant
2345 allée des Bibliothèques
Local 0258-C
Québec, Québec G1V 0A6
Canada
Telephone: 418.656.2131, ext. 2871
Email: Jo-Anne.Belair@bibl.ulaval.ca

and
Denis Dolbec
Spécialiste en ressources documentaires
Répertoire de Vedettes-Matière (RVM)
Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval
Pavillon Jean-Charles-Bonenfant
2345 allée des Bibliothèques
Local 0258-C
Québec, Québec G1V 0A6 Canada
Telephone: 418.656.2131, ext. 6105
Email: Denise.Dolbec@bibl.ulaval.ca

4) Deutsches Archäologisches Institut NACO

Document 8

- Contact: Dr. phil. Monika Linder
Bibliotheksdirektorin (Library Director)
Podbielskiallee 69-71
D-14195 Berlin
Telephone: + 49 (0)1888 7711-123
Fax: + 49 (0)1888 7711-168
Email: ml@dainst.de
Website: www.dainst.org
- 5) Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz CONSER
Contact: Ulrike Junger, Dipl.-Theol., Dipl.-Psych.
Acting Director, Dept. Of Bibliographic Service
Director German Union Catalogue of Serials
Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - - Preußischer Kulturbesitz
Potsdamer Straße 33
D-10785 Berlin
Telephone: + 49 (0) 30 266.2478
Fax: + 49 (0) 30 266.2378
Email: ulrike.junger@sbb.spk-berlin.de
Websites: www.zeitschriftendatenbank.de
<http://Staatsbibliothek-Berlin.de/>
- 6) Tufts University PCC
Contact: Suzanne Bremer
Project Coordinator
Global Development and Environment Institute
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155
Telephone: 617.627.6871
Fax: 617.627.2409
Email: suzanne.bremer@tufts.edu
Website: www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae

Two personal invitations were extended to me during the “poster session”. The Humboldt Universität zu Berlin requested that a presentation be made in German to the Berlin School of Library and Information Science during the Spring semester 2009. An official invitation should be forthcoming from Professor Michael Seadle, Ph.D.

Dr. Ekaterina Zaytseva, representing the Russian National Public Library for Science and Technology located in Moscow, asked that I speak in Russian about the PCC at a conference in the Crimea to be held in June 2009. An official invitation should be forthcoming.

Contact information for Dr. Seadle and Dr. Zaytseva, both of whom have extended these verbal invitations, is available.

Document 8

Recommendations / Observations / Action Items

- 1) Each of the 6 institutions represented in this short list should be contacted officially to **follow-up** on the interest they have expressed in each of the component programs of the PCC.
- 2) In keeping with the LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, and in particular recommendation 1.2.3.3, it is prudent that ongoing budgetary requests be made for support of PCC activities at IFLA.
- 3) The interest of international library participation in the PCC is extremely dependent on a good marketing strategy, which includes,
 - a) Good Web pages with access to appropriate documentation at no cost
 - b) Discussion of agreements to be provided bilingually or in as many languages as needed
 - c) Webcasting or availability of Web courses for compliance with mutually-agreed upon standards
- 4) Follow-up with other international members who have visited the Cooperative Cataloging Program who have expressed interest in the PCC who have not actively pursued membership
 - a) National Library of Sweden
 - b) National Library of Iceland

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON AUTOMATION
ANNUAL REPORT
OCT. 2007-SEPT. 2008**

Activities: The Committee's basic activity for the year was review of its charge. This included planning for, gathering, and incorporating feedback from its constituency. Direct feedback was gathered at the BIBCO/CONSER operations meeting in May with additional comment sought via email to the various PCC lists after ALA annual. In the end, the Committee determined its charge required no revision.

Meetings: The Committee met at both ALA midwinter and annual conferences. Its primary business at both meetings was a review of the Committee's charge as charged by the Steering Committee. At annual, the Committee additionally discussed software updating issues with the PCC BibPURL server and the potential for expanding the use of BibPURLs from just open access resources to include licensed resources as well. The Committee agreed on the fact that the current environment is in too high level of flux, e.g. WorldCat local developments, to consider expanding the use of BibPURLs at this time. With regards to the software updating issue, the Committee learned that OCLC is upgrading its PURL software, but because it runs on a different machine, not the PCC BibPURL software. As PCC members derive significant benefit from the centralized management of BibPURLs, PCC members sought support from the Committee in asking OCLC to include the PCC BibPURL server in its upgrading plans. The consensus among the SCA was that direct communication from the PCC leadership, PoCo, to OCLC requesting an upgrade to the PCC BibPURL software, would best communicate the importance of this service to the PCC membership.

Membership: Last year the PCC Steering Committee charged the SCA Chair with increasing the membership of the Committee by adding two new members in each of the years 2007/08 and 2008/09 so as to bring its size up to the level of the other standing committees. For 2007/08, Gary Charbonneau accepted a one-year extension of his term. For 2008/09, a call for volunteers was issued and from a pool of three applicants, Rebecca Lubas was selected and appointed, with a term to end Sept. 30, 2011. On Sept. 30, 2008, Charbonneau's extended term ended and in addition, Gary Strawn's term ended as well; both were reappointed. Because of the timing of these appointments, these three members now have terms that end Sept. 30, 2011. For the full picture, note that Committee member Bob Thomas and Committee Chair Adolfo Tarango's terms end Sept. 30, 2010. In order to better space out the appointments of members and Chair, we ask the Steering Committee to approve the following:

1. Extend Thomas' term by one year, to expire Sept. 2011 (same as Lubas)
2. Extend Charbonneau and Strawn's terms by one year, to expire Sept. 2012

The net result is creation of a three year appointment rotation of 2 members, 2 members, Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Adolfo R. Tarango

Chair - PCC Standing Committee on Automation

October 28, 2008

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

**SCS Report
PCC PoCo Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS MEMBERSHIP:

Diane Boehr, NLM	Ann Caldwell, Brown
Renette Davis, Univ. of Chicago	Peter Fletcher, UCLA
Joe Kiegel, Univ. of Washington	David Miller, PoCo Liaison
Dave Reser, LC Liaison	Joan Schuitema, UIC (Chair)
Ann Sitkin, Harvard Law	Jay Weitz, OCLC Liaison

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Recruited 2 new members: Ann Caldwell, Renette Davis
- Established 4 new PCC task groups (see below)
- Drafted a new charge that was reviewed by the PCC membership and submitted to Steering for approval on 10/08/08
- Updated the “Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets” in core records as recommended in the report of the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access. The revision was approved by Steering and has been posted on the PCC website.
- Discussed the recommendations of the PCC Ad Hoc Series Review Task Force and were exploring alternative options at the time Steering announced their decision.
- Approved guidelines for coding series information in PCC records in light of the MARBI decision to make the 440 obsolete; expected to be implemented by the end of October.
- Drafting proposed guidelines for creating post-cataloging series authority records; first draft to be completed by the end of October.

TASK GROUPS:

Joint LC/PCC LCRI/RDA Task Group

Membership:

Sherman Clarke, NYU
Renette Davis, SCS rep
Bob Hiatt, LC
Bob Maxwell, BYU
Hideyuki Morimoto, Columbia (Starr East Asian Library)
Adam Schiff, Univ. of Washington

Status: A chart of all of the LCRIs and corresponding RDA rules has been created. Each person on the task force has volunteered to take several former AACR2 chapters and compare the LCRIs for those chapters with the corresponding RDA rules. They will be indicating on the chart which LCRIs should be retained in full, which should be retained but revised, and which can be omitted. Work will begin as soon as the RDA draft is released in October.

Task Group on the Internationalization of the Authority Files

Membership:

Eric Childress, OCLC
Peter Fletcher, SCS
Joe Kiegel, SCS
Bill Leonard, Library and Archives Canada
Joan Schuitema, SCS (co-chair)
Barbara Tillett, LC (co-chair)

Status: This group is currently reviewing existing models for an international authority file and will identify the pros/cons of each in terms of feasibility for PCC participation. Review of PCC governance documents as well as previous recommendations PCC has made concerning international participation is also underway. Target date for completion of the group’s report remains 01/15/09.

Document 10

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group

Membership:

Becky Culbertson (UC San Diego, Co-Chair)
Robert Bremer (OCLC, technical)
Jackie Dooley (Head, Special Collections and Archives, U. of Calif. Irvine)
Kate Harcourt (Columbia, education, PCC MARC Vendor Guide TF chair)
Anne Harris (ebrary, vendor/publisher community)
Ryan Hildebrand (University of California Irvine, rare books)
Claudia Horning (UCLA, repository copies of ebooks, nonmetadata/cataloger)
Yael Mandelstam (Fordham, law cataloging)
Shana McDanold (UPenn, advisor from serials community)
George Prager (NYU Law, Co-Chair, special libraries community)
Dave Reser (LC, CPSO)
Karen Sinkule (National Library of Medicine)
Carolyn Sturtevant (LC, ex-officio)
Larissa Walsh (UChicago, digital registry community)
Susan Westberg (OCLC, Googlebooks, mass digitization community)

Status: This task group has been charged with developing a provider-neutral cataloging model for a single bibliographic record that could be used for all the instances of an online monograph. They plan to deliver their final report along with a set of guidelines and an FAQ to SCS by 10/17/08.

Task Force on Non-Latin Script Cataloging Documentation

Status: Following up on the recommendation II.3 of the *Task Force on Non-English Access*. Rev. Mar 16, 2007, “to review and update the core level supplement on “Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets,” SCS discovered this was only one of many documents needing revision. During the May 2008 OpCo meetings, a recommendation was made to form a PCC task force to produce documentation for entering non-Latin scripts in PCC bibliographic records. SCS is finalizing the draft charge which should be sent to Steering for approval by the end of October. A list of potential members has also been identified.

SCS QUESTIONS/CONCERNS:

- Will PCC be drafting a formal response to the report of the LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control?
- What role will PCC play in testing RDA and how will a decision be made as to whether PCC will/won't adopt RDA?

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

Annual Report, FY 2008

PCC Standing Committee on Training (SCT)

October 2008

The PCC Standing Committee on Training has been actively working on various training initiatives as outlined below.

PCC SCT committee members: Paige Andrew (Pennsylvania State University), Barbara Bushman (National Library of Medicine), Andrea Stamm (Northwestern University), Rebecca Uhl, Incoming Chair (Arizona State University)

Members who cycled off on September 30, 2008: Jacqueline Byrd (Indiana University), Caroline Miller, Outgoing Chair (University of California, Los Angeles)

Liaisons: Glenn Patton (OCLC), Carolyn Sturtevant (LC/BIBCO)

Work Completed on Proposed Committee Charge

After receiving input from the committee, the Standing Committee on Training Charge the proposed update will read (additions marked by asterisks):

The Standing Committee on Training shall identify the need for *online* training programs *in addition to in-person* workshops and institutes aimed at developing cataloging skills that support the Program goals for both new participants and for continuing education and shall identify, develop as necessary, and promote the distribution of easy-to-use *online* documentation in support of Program goals.

Task Group to Develop Training in Map Cataloging

Report from Paige Andrew (October 2008)

I completed 90% of our CMS training in early September, and now that I am done traveling as of this workshop on Monday, I will complete the remaining small part of the CMS training early next week, then get paired up with a "coach" as well as a member of our ITECH staff and should begin putting up some content by the end of next week (Nov. 3-7). My goal is to have some textual content up on the website by the Christmas break. The next goal is to have all textual content and possibly one or two interactive features in place by ALA Midwinter 2009 so that I can show that off at the PCC SCT meeting in Denver. I don't know where things will be or how soon I can complete something for actual use as of this moment, but I think by Christmas I will have a clearer idea on that. Ideally, I'd like to be able to go to Chicago for ALA Annual in 2009 year and get final approval by the PCC SCT members and then use next summer to work on any kind of online course that the PCC or others may want to try.

Task Group members:

Paige Andrew, Chair (Pennsylvania State University)

Susan Moore (University of Northern Iowa)

Mary Larsgaard, consultant (University of California, Santa Barbara).

NLM Medical Cataloging Course

Report from Barbara Bushman (October 2008):

For the online courses we should have the entire content of the MeSH course ready for PCC by ALA Midwinter 2009. We are currently finishing the last couple modules. Hopefully it will also be available on our website as an online course but I cannot guarantee that. Our goal is to also have the content for the Classification course completed, but we are not as far along with that course at the moment. We are trying to have it completed by Midwinter, but I am not positive we will meet that goal.

RDA Implementation Task Force

Report from Barbara Bushman, SCT liaison to the Task Force (October 2008)

The only news from the RDA Implementation Task Force is that the Task Force is sponsoring both a preconference and a program at ALA Annual Chicago related to RDA.

New PCC Standing Committee on Training Chair

Rebecca Uhl (Arizona State University) will be the new incoming Chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Training when Caroline Miller's term is over in September 2008. Welcome Becky!

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline R. Miller

Outgoing Chair, PCC Standing Committee on Training

October 2008

and

Rebecca Uhl

Incoming Chair, PCC Standing Committee on Training

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

: Revised Mission Statements of the Standing Committees

Standing Committee on Automation

The Standing Committee on Automation shall identify automation issues to be resolved in order to implement the mission of the Program and shall formulate plans to present PCC requirements to vendors; to elicit support from other organizations which share automation interests, e.g., LITA; and to facilitate cooperation among LC, Program participants and the bibliographic utilities to work together on the Program's automation requirements and goals.

Standing Committee on Standards

The Standing Committee on Standards shall evaluate, review, and participate in the formulation and development of revised, accepted, or newly developing cataloging/metadata standards; promote the use of mutually acceptable standards within all PCC programs; and shall maintain current awareness of work being done in this arena to determine which standards are appropriate to the needs of the PCC.

Standing Committee on Training:

The Standing Committee on Training shall identify the need for online training programs in addition to in-person workshops and institutes aimed at developing cataloging skills that support the Program goals for both new participants and for continuing education and shall identify, develop as necessary, and promote the distribution of easy-to-use online documentation in support of Program goals.

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

Document 12: Strategic plan items that require action

Strategic Direction 2, Objective 3.

Objective 3: Identify funding sources to support PCC activities.

Status: Ask PoCo for their recommendations on the top three immediate activities or projects PoCo would like to see funded. If there is agreement on a project a group can be formed to identify funding sources. If no projects can be readily identified at the meeting or after, this objective will be shelved until an idea is identified.

Strategic Direction 3, Objective 2, Action 1.

Objective 2: Explore opportunities for repurposing publisher created metadata.

Action 1: Commission report on the current status of ONIX standards and other related EDItEUR/NISO standards.

Status: The following Aug. 2008 update released to many email lists by Kathy Klemperer is a good concise update of serials related ONIX formats:

<http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/0806/msg00109.html> The ONIX serial formats focus on holdings related publisher/content provider data: issue release, issue identification, and holdings, etc. The ONIX book standard is much more focused on sharing bibliographic data. Probably the most direct collaborative experimentation with publisher supplied bibliographic data for books is the OCLC Next Generation Cataloging project

<http://www.oclc.org/partnerships/material/nexgen/nextgencataloging.htm> David Williamson from LC and people from other PCC institutions are involved with this OCLC project.

Suggested Action: Task the Standing Committee on Standards and Standing Committee on Automation to provide a joint summary of the various ONIX related efforts going on for PoCo. The recent summary for ONIX for serials could be used and people involved in the OCLC Next Generation Cataloging project could be asked to provide an update on that effort. Let this summary inform the decision on whether a task group is needed for the following objective.

Time Frame: Discuss the idea with PoCo Nov. 2008

Strategic Direction 3, Objective 3, Action 1.

Objective 3: Partner with outside communities to develop cooperative metadata projects and activities.

Action 1: Meet with representatives from OCLC to discuss OCLC/PCC mutual goals for metadata providers/producers.

Statement of work: Set goals and outcome with OCLC staff prior to the meeting. Recommended topics include: identifying existing partnerships, opportunities to exploit metadata received from vendors, and non-MARC metadata partnerships

Product: Summary report

Status: Meeting is scheduled for Dec. 2008

Time Frame: 2008

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

Working Group on the Bibliographic Future PCC-Related Recommendations

1.2.1 Share Responsibility for Creating Bibliographic Records

1.2.1.1 LC, library and publishing communities: Share responsibility for creating original cataloging according to interest, use, and ability. Consider categories of materials for which responsibilities can be distributed and categories of metadata that can be appropriately provided by each of the participants.

1.2.1.2 LC: Analyze the Library's use of PCC-produced data and determine how to take full advantage of the shared product.

1.2.2 Examine Current Original Cataloging Programs and Sub-Programs at the Library of Congress

1.2.2.1 LC: Identify all distinct cataloging programs and operations within the Library of Congress; determine the relative importance of each to the Library and to other libraries; use these determinations to inform management decisions as to priority, continuation, or reshaping of programs, etc.

1.2.2.2 LC: For those aspects of operations that extend beyond the Library's immediate mission as the Library of Congress, identify other entities or groups with the interest and ability to assume responsibility for them.

1.2.2.3 LC: Work with interested entities such as PCC, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), professional organizations, publishers, etc. to plan transition to new distribution of responsibilities.

1.2.3 Expand Number of PCC Participants

1.2.3.1 PCC: Assess barriers and incentives to participation by more libraries, including PCC's and LC's abilities to manage a larger scale effort of collaboration.

1.2.3.2 PCC: Reduce personnel and other costs to PCC participants and to LC.

1.2.3.3 PCC: Actively recruit new participants. Develop a "marketing program" for PCC, publicizing its work and benefits.

1.2.3.4 PCC: Develop management mechanisms to ensure nimble decision-making and planning by PCC.

1.2.4 Increase Incentives for Sharing Bibliographic Records

1.2.4.1 LC, PCC, and OCLC: Explore ways to increase incentives and tools for contributions of new bibliographic records, as well as upgrades or corrections to existing records to the national (and international) shared bibliographic and authority databases.

Document 13

- 1.2.4.2 All: Explore tools and techniques for sharing bibliographic data at the network level using both centralized and non-centralized techniques (e.g., OAI-PMH (Open Archive Initiative – Protocol for Metadata Harvesting)).

Recommendations

1.3.1 Increase Collaboration on Authority Data

- 1.3.1.1 LC, PCC: Identify ways to promote wider participation in the distribution of responsibility for creating, enhancing, and maintaining authority data.
- 1.3.1.2 LC, PCC, and library community: Work with other interested parties (e.g., American Library Association (ALA) divisions, state libraries, regional OCLC affiliates) to enhance, expand, and make more affordable training opportunities in the area of authority data creation.
- 1.3.1.3 All: Explore the creation of more tools to facilitate authority record creation and to better integrate record sharing within library workflows.
- 1.3.1.4 LC, PCC, and OCLC: Explore ways to increase incentives to facilitate contributions of new authority records and of upgrades or corrections to existing records in the national (and international) shared bibliographic and authority databases.

1.3.2 Increase Re-Use of Assigned Authoritative Headings

- 1.3.2.1 LC, library community, library system vendors, publishers: Investigate convergences of name authority and identity management in various contexts, such as libraries, publishing, and repository management.
- 1.3.2.2 LC: Bring together other communities working on problems of identification of authors and other creators; map the issues; and investigate possibilities for cooperation.
- 1.3.2.3 LC: Make the LC Name Authority file available as a Web resource, for downloading or linking to through various Web service interfaces.

1.3.3 Internationalize Authority Files

- 1.3.3.1 LC, OCLC, and National Libraries: Pursue more aggressively the development of internationally shared authority files.
- 1.3.3.2 LC, OCLC, and National Libraries: Work actively to advance a uniform approach to linking national and international authority records that represent the same entity.
- 1.3.3.3 All: Create a file structure that will enable institutions to determine which forms of headings are authorized

Document 13

2.1.1 Make the Discovery of Rare, Unique, and other Special Hidden Materials a High Priority

2.1.1.1 All: Direct resources to support the discovery of these materials, including resources freed by the institution from economies realized in other areas.

2.1.1.2 All: Gather and share data on access paths that guide researchers to unique materials as a means to inform best practices for access in a Web environment.

2.1.1.3 All: Make finding aids accessible via online catalogs and available on the Internet.

2.1.2 Streamline Cataloging for Rare, Unique, and other Special Hidden Materials, Emphasizing Greater Coverage and Broader Access

2.1.2.1 All: Adopt as a guiding principle that some level of access must be provided to all materials as a first step to comprehensive access, as appropriate. Allow for different cataloging levels depending on the types of documents, their nature, and richness.

2.1.2.2 All: Establish cataloging practices that are practicable and flexible, and that reflect the needs of users and the reality of limited resources.

2.1.2.3 LC: Encourage adoption of current rules and practices (e.g., DCRM(B)¹⁸ and DACS¹⁹) for cataloging of unique and rare materials, including options for streamlined cataloging, and shared use of and creation of authority records across collections, as applicable.

2.1.2.4 All: Consider different levels of cataloging and processing for all types of rare and unique materials, depending on institutional priorities and importance and potential use of materials, while still following national standards and practices.

2.1.3 Integrate Access to Rare, Unique, and Other Special Hidden Materials with Other Library Materials

2.1.3.1 All: Integrate access tools (finding aids, metadata records, databases, authority files, etc.) for unique and rare materials into the information access structures that serve the institution as a whole.

2.1.4 Encourage Digitization to Allow Broader Access

2.1.4.1 LC: Study possibilities for computational access to digital content. Use this information in developing new rules and best practices.

2.1.4.2 All: Study usage patterns to inform digitization priorities.

2.1.5 Share Access to Rare, Unique, and other Special Hidden Materials

2.1.5.1 All: Encourage inter-institutional collaboration for sharing metadata records and authority records for rare and unique materials.

Document 13

2.1.5.2 All: Encourage libraries and archives to submit records for rare and unique materials to shared databases such as OCLC.

2.1.5.3 All: Examine financial and other incentives and disincentives to the sharing of records for rare and unique materials. Modify systems, practices, and agreements as necessary to increase incentives and decrease disincentives.

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)

Document 13

Document 13 Continued

Report on the Future of Bibliographic Control

LCSH-related points

under BACKGROUND, BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (p. 4)

“It (LC) also manages two vital access tools, the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)”

under FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC PRODUCTION

1.3 Collaborate on Authority Record Creation

... “Subject analysis—including analyzing content and creating and applying subject headings and classification numbers—is a core function of cataloging; although expensive, it is nonetheless critical. While subject headings are recognized as essential for collocating topical information, the complexity of LCSH creates difficulties for heading creation and use. At present, the process of maintaining LCSH and of creating new or revised headings can be slow to meet the needs of those working with emerging concepts in both published and archival materials.”

(4) POSITION OUR COMMUNITY FOR THE FUTURE

4.3 Optimize LCSH for Use and Reuse

- WG recognizes that subject analysis is a core function of cataloging
- LCSH has great value in providing subject access
- Often is the only searchable subject term set
- But suffers from a structure that is cumbersome from both administrative and automation points of views
- LCSH vocabulary is out of synch with common terminology
- Creation of pre-coordinated strings is time-consuming and inexact (Cf. 4-v. SCM difficulties)
- SCM rules do not always enable relationships among pre-coordinated strings to be made manifest
- Order of subdivisions may not represent relationships well
- SCM may hinder subject access (“rule of three”)
- Subject specificity a plus, but more general subject access may assist entry portal to more specific, but SCM does not allow for BT terms in bibliographic records

Document 13

- LCSH structure as an alphabetical list does not facilitate browsing within a particular discipline or topic
- Above point might be lessened if there were a more thorough correlation between LCSH and LCC

Consequences of Maintaining the Status Quo

LCSH's complexity in conjunction with its idiosyncratic updating and seemingly capricious limitations on its application have negative consequences for both catalogers and catalog users and mitigate against its use by stakeholders outside the library community

Non-topical, non-hierarchical organization of LCSH makes systematic coordinated updating of the vocabulary difficult

Complexity of rules that guide creation of subject strings leads to errors in construction, and then inconsistencies in controlled vocabulary

LCSH are used primarily by those with prior subject knowledge, while subject novices turn to other tools such as Internet engines that do not penalize the lack of subject expertise

Recommendations

- 4.3.1 Transform LCSH
 - 4.3.1.1 LC: Make LCSH into a tool that provides a more flexible means to create and modify subject authority data
 - 4.3.1.2 LC: Provide LCSH openly for use by library and non-library stakeholders
 - 4.3.1.3 LC: Provide LCSH in its current alphabetical arrangement and enable its customized assembly into topical thesauri
 - 4.3.1.4 LC: Increase explicit correlation and referencing between LCSH terms and LCC and DDC numbers
- 4.3.2 Pursue De-Coupling of Subject Strings
 - 4.3.2.1 LC: Work with OCLC to identify a scheme or product that could take advantage of the power of LCSH's controlled vocabulary and serve as a base to take advantage of terminologies that function in a more accessible environment with broader audiences (FAST cited as an example)
 - 4.3.2.2 All: Evaluate the ability of LCSH to support faceted browsing and discovery
- 4.3.3 Encourage Application of, and Cross-Referencing with, Other Controlled Subject Vocabularies

Document 13

- 4.3.3.1 LC and other providers of subject vocabularies: Provide references within LCSH where appropriate and between LCSH and other established sources of controlled subject headings (MeSH, NAL, Sears, Getty). Make vocabularies cross-searchable and interoperable
- 4.3.3.2 All: Apply terms from any and all appropriate sources of controlled subject headings in bibliographic records to augment subject access
- 4.3.3.3 All: Explore mechanisms to exploit cross-vocabulary linkages to enhance retrieval, without limiting to the headings explicitly provided in individual bibliographic records
- 4.3.3.4 LC and OCLC: Explore ways of reducing creation costs and improving effectiveness by working more closely between DDC, LCSH, and LCC, the main “universal” library approaches to subject access
- 4.3.4 Recognize the Potential of Computational Indexing in the Practice of Subject Analysis
 - 4.3.4.1 All: For works where full text is available in digital form, study the extent to which computational analysis and indexing of the digital text can supplement or substitute for traditional intellectual subject analysis
 - 4.3.4.2 LC: Based on the results of the previous recommendation, examine tradeoffs and potential resource savings of using computational analysis and indexing to substitute for some subject analysis
 - 4.3.4.3 All: Initiate a standards process that allows the various results of computational analysis and indexing to be interchanged and shared as part of bibliographic records, in order to permit sharing of metadata without necessarily sharing the underlying resource

Desired Outcomes:

LCSH will be easier to update and to apply

Terminology will be more current and consistent

Subject cataloging process will be more straightforward

An easier, more intuitive application of subject terminology will save time and free catalogers for other work

Restructuring LCSH will make it useful to a wider range of users, as well as facilitate navigation and manipulation in user interfaces

The addition to bibliographic records of subject terms from other thesauri will provide more, and more varied, subject access to resources

[\[Back to PoCo Agenda\]](#)