

The PCC Ad Hoc Series Review Task Force
Discussion Paper on PCC Series Policies and Practices
Dec. 14, 2007

Purpose

This paper is intended to elicit comments and discussion on series practices from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and wider cataloging community. Readers are asked to use the specific tasks listed in the task force charge as the primary criteria for evaluating the proposals in this paper. The PCC Ad Hoc Series Review Task Force is tasked with making recommendations that result in "simple, unified PCC policies, procedures and series authority data elements in PCC records" (Task Force charge: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/SeriesReviewTF.html>).

Additionally, readers are referred to the values listed in the *PCC Values Statement* <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/values.html> for generalized criteria for evaluating the recommendations.

Summary of current LC and PCC practice

As of June 1, 2007 LC catalogers no longer check series authority records for treatment decisions and no longer create series authority records. Series statements are input as untraced (490 0) in records created by LC; series fields are accepted "as is" on copy.

LC continues to maintain the PCC series documentation and to support PCC series authority record (SAR) contribution through training, answering questions, etc.

For PCC records, the requirement is to follow the decisions in the authority file for presence and form of controlled series access points in analytic records. This includes not tracing series that were coded as untraced prior to Sept. 1, 1989, when LC policy was to trace only some series. From that time until June 1, 2006, LC policy was to trace all new series.

BIBCO guidelines are slightly different for full and core. In full records, all series must be backed up by authority records; any series already established as "traced" must be traced, and all new series must be traced. In core records, any series already established as "traced" must be traced; any new series may be either traced (and supported by an authority record) or untraced (with no authority record created).

The CONSER full and core standards required checking for series authority records, following established tracing decisions, and creating series authority records. The CONSER Standard Record (CSR) guidelines, which have replaced full and core standards for new records, require checking for existing series authority records and following established treatment. The only reference in CSR guidelines to *not* creating a series authority record is in the 4XX area: "... In cases where no series authority exists or will be created, transcribe the series statement so that usage can be documented."¹

On OCLC, any library with full authorization can change series treatment on LC monographic records. Enhance authorization is not required to make these changes. However, CONSER authorization is required to make changes to any CONSER-authenticated record.

A fall 2007 query on PCCLIST about current treatment of series indicated that many libraries use vendor services or local programming to convert untraced series to traced and to verify series headings, with minimal staff follow-up. Libraries reported a high level of satisfaction with this processing.

There has been a 7% increase in the number of series authority records created by PCC libraries in fiscal year 2007. Several respondents to the PCCLIST query commented on the increase in their libraries, but none reported being burdened by the additional work, or commented on the overall decrease in new authority records without LC's participation.

Introduction to proposals

Series authority control appears to be in good health a year and a half after being abandoned by LC. However with easier creation of series authority records and more use of automation, PCC members could do more to provide standardized access to series. In this paper, we present proposals for post-cataloging creation of authority records, and for simplified documentation for all authority records. We also drafted a discussion paper for consideration by MARBI in January 2008 to eliminate the 440 field in order to simplify machine manipulation of series tracings. These proposals are numbered 1-3 below and a prototype of simplified guidelines is contained in the appendix.

This paper also outlines three proposals for options in PCC policy for series authority work. Members of the group do not agree on whether the PCC should continue to require series tracings. Some feel that it is important to the mission of cooperative cataloging that PCC records be consistent in this regard. They also hold that required tracing is needed to ensure an adequate number of new authority records. Others believe that given the effectiveness of automated verification and the existing support of series authority control by PCC libraries, PCC can endorse series authority control without requiring series tracings.

¹ *CONSER Standard Record Documentation 5/30/2007*, p. 8, <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/conserdoc.pdf>

Proposal 1: Post-cataloging SARs

Allow the creation of SARs post-cataloging, using the notation "resource not in hand" in 670 \$b instead of the source of the title.

Many libraries accept copy with minimal review, relying on post-cataloging processing to control the form of headings. This processing allows the majority of headings to be verified automatically, with staff review of those which do not match authority records. SARs created for these non-matching headings could supplement those created in the process of original cataloging.

For example, the first two volumes of "Asan Foundation translation series" were cataloged by LC, and under current policy, the series is untraced and there is no SAR. At Duke University, the series was converted from untraced to traced by the vendor LTI, and the tracing showed up on a list of unlinked headings. Duke does not have the staff time to retrieve the volumes from the stacks, but could create a SAR based on the title as transcribed by LC.

More discussion is needed about how these records would be coded. There is concern that without the resources in hand, variant titles would be missed and duplication would be more likely. The group has debated the use of the fixed field code for "preliminary" vs. that for "provisional" vs. the creation of a new code vs. no special coding, but has not been able to reach consensus.

Proposal 2: Guidelines for simple SARs

Draft greatly simplified guidelines for the creation of SARs (both post-cataloging and with the resource in hand) for monographic series to cover the simplest and most common cases. The guidelines should assume use of a macro such as OCLC's "GenerateAuthorityRecord" and include a "cheat sheet" defining the basic elements of the SAR.

A draft of the simplified guidelines is found in the appendix.

More discussion is needed about how these guidelines would relate to the full documentation and the existing training program. Would the guidelines be used only by those libraries which had received the full training, or might some libraries be allowed to create simple SARs with less training?

Proposal 3: Eliminate the 440 field (presented in more detail in a MARBI discussion paper <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2008/2008-dp02.html>)

Make the 440 field obsolete, requiring all controlled series to be entered in 8XX fields. This would leave 490 as the only remaining tag in the 4XX block, essentially redefining that block as being only for transcription of series statements

Machine manipulation of headings is easier when there is a clear distinction between transcribed and controlled forms. The blurring of this distinction is also a cause of confusion for many library staff being trained. However, eliminating the 440 would involve an extra step in cataloging in cases where the controlled form is the same as the transcribed form.

Three options for PCC policy on tracing series

A. Required

Require libraries to continue tracing series on all PCC records if a series authority record exists with PCC treatment of traced. Require libraries to continue tracing all new series on PCC full records. Require traced series to be supported by an authority record.

Pros:

- Supports the IME ICC Statement of International Cataloguing Principles which lists "uniform title of the series" along with "names of additional creators beyond the first", "names of performers or persons, families, or corporate bodies in other roles than creator", "parallel titles, caption titles, etc.", "bibliographic record identifiers", "language", "country of publication", "year(s) of publication or issuance", and "physical medium" as "Additional access points".
- Sends a signal to library administrators that PCC believes series authority control is still important to users (both library staff and other users).
- Facilitates automated series authority control. If fewer institutions create authority records for new series there will be fewer series authority records for automated series authority programs to match against, which will make machine manipulation of series less effective
- Enables users of PCC records to assume that series authority work has been done for all records.
- Especially for libraries relying on manual verification of series statements, it is more efficient if the controlled form is supplied by one library at the time of initial cataloging, rather than by multiple libraries each dealing with copy in their local catalogs.

B. Optional

Make series tracing optional on PCC records, while continuing to require traced series to be supported by an authority record. With tracing an option, there would be no need to record the traced/not traced on national authority records, which would simply record the authorized form for libraries choosing to use it. Series that were not traced by LC before Sept. 1, 1989 could be traced. Authority records for series-like phrases would continue to record decisions not to treat those phrases as series.

Pros:

- Allows LC cataloging to meet PCC requirements for series. LC CONSER standard records for serials within series would meet PCC requirements and LC monograph records could once again be coded "pcc" in the 042 field. As in the past, "pcc" would be used only on records input by LC. The code "lccopycat" would be used for adaptations of other institutions' records, which may contain traced series not necessarily supported by SARs
- Fulfills the Task Group's charge of "simple, unified PCC policies, procedures and series authority data elements."
- Provides options for institutions to decide how their staff resources will be allocated for the series work that is most important to their constituencies. Facilitating options for series work may be an attractive option for expanding international PCC membership in the future.
- If there is a simple choice between untraced series in 490 fields and series traced in 8XX fields and supported by SARs (cf. proposal to abolish the 440), it will be clear which option has been used in any record.
- With automated verification, and some staff follow-up, the controlled form of the series can be generated from the transcribed form efficiently and accurately.

C. Compromise.

Continue the current policy for PCC full records, while making tracing completely optional for core (monographs) and minimal level (serials) records. On all levels of records, continue to require all traced series to be supported by authority records.

Pros:

- Sends a signal (somewhat less strongly than option A) to library administrators that PCC believes series authority control is still important to users (both library staff and other users).
- Provides consistent treatment of series on full PCC records.
- Because LC's default level for monographs is core, these records could once again be coded "pcc." As in the past, "pcc" would be used only on records input by LC. The code

“lccopycat” would be used for adaptations of other institutions’ records, which may contain traced series not necessarily supported by SARs.

- LC serials catalogers could continue to contribute records for serials within series to the CONSER database by coding them minimal level. CONSER minimal level would be redefined to include serials within series where the series was not checked in the authority file. Existing CONSER Standard Records should not be changed to a lower level if later issues show a new series title. (The cataloger would either need to check the authority file in these few cases or would not add the new series to the record.)
- With some limitations according to the level of the record, libraries would have more flexibility in whether to trace series.

Need for ongoing discussion

After the basic PCC series policy is settled, we will need to continue discussion of policy, training and documentation. LC continues to support series authority control in these areas. The fact that they do this with no catalogers involved in the front-line work means that PCC catalogers have a special responsibility to engage in dialog about the evolution of the standards.

In this paper, we have emphasized the broader issues, but the task group also brainstormed about more specific ways to simplify SAR creation. For example, we considered several changes to the requirement to support 5XX fields with 675 fields. Is it really necessary to copy this information from the record in which it supports a 1XX? If we continue to require the 1XX/5XX to be supported on both SARs, could we simplify the copy and paste operation by leaving the tag 670 rather than 675, or by changing the subfield coding guidelines so that neither field requires a subfield b?

In the section on tracing options, we point out that if tracing becomes optional, there will be no need to record a tracing decision in the 645 field. Since classification and analysis are local decisions, we considered the possibility of making fields 644-646 local and optional.

We invite comments on these ideas, and more suggestions for simplifying SAR creation.

Conclusion

With the increased use of post-cataloging verification, whether a series is traced when a resource is initially cataloged may be less important than in the past. Accurate transcription of the series statement allows the tracing to be supplied automatically, and can even be used as a basis for new authority records. Automation also makes it easier to change tracing decisions years after cataloging. At least one vendor (LTI) traces all series supported by an authority record, including those not traced by LC prior to September 1989. With continuing automatic authority control, series that are not traced in the absence of an authority record can be traced later when an authority record is created.

While recognizing that not all libraries can afford to trace all series at the point of cataloging, and that automated verification is an effective way to address this, we encourage cooperative changes to copy. Whenever practical, series tracings should be added to the OCLC master record by libraries making that change for their local catalogs. We also encourage OCLC to investigate ways to make such changes automatically and systematically, as many libraries are doing locally.

Whichever policy the PCC chooses, it is important for individual libraries to have choices in how to focus staff resources devoted to series authority control. For example, some libraries might choose to create authority records for numbered monographic series, but not for multi-part items or unnumbered series. Academic libraries might judge scientific/technical series and those on government documents more important than publishers' genre-type series. In public libraries, emphasis could be given to children's and juvenile literature, *belles lettres*, and "how-to" series.

Responses to our query about PCC series practice, informal communications from the library community, and the continuing creation of SARs all indicate that series authority control is strongly supported. We hope that our proposals, discussion generated by this paper, and advances in automation and in cooperation will help it continue to thrive.

Appendix. Guidelines for SARs for the simplest monographic series

These guidelines cover creation of authority records for simple monographic series.

Multi-part items, series-like phrases, subseries, monographic series appropriate for corporate body main entry (AACR2 21.1B2), and see-also references for major title changes are outside of the scope of this document.

Determining the controlled form of the series title

- Do not include an initial article, other title information, parallel title, statement of responsibility, ISSN, or numbering.
- Search to be sure that the series isn't already established, perhaps under a variant form.
- If the title on the resource being cataloged differs from the title in the SAR heading, see AACR2 21.2C1 for what constitutes a major title change. Minor title changes can be added as see references.
- If the titles of the series is the same as the title of another series or serial, add a qualifier according to LCRI 25.5B.
 - Generic titles: the qualifier is “the body issuing or publishing the serial/series.”
 - Non-generic titles: decide which qualifier would best distinguish the series from others. The two most frequently used qualifiers are publisher and place of publication.
 - When qualifying by corporate body or place, search the LC/NAF and use the established form for the qualifier. If it is not yet established, establish it.

Creating a new series authority record

- Enter the controlled form of the series in the bibliographic record.
- Use the OCLC macro “GenerateAuthorityRecord”) or other local tool to create an authority record, which can often be accepted with no, or minimal, editing.
- If the source of the series title isn't the series title page, change the source of title in the 670 from the default “series t.p.” to the actual priority order source.
- Add whatever references would help users and other catalogers find the established form, for example:
 - Variant forms found on the resource, including acronyms and abbreviated forms.
 - A subtitle that might be mistaken for the title.
 - For series published by a corporate body that is not a commercial publisher, the title entered under the AACR2 form of the corporate body.
 - The title qualified by a body other than the one you chose to use in the heading.
- Check to make sure that references do not conflict with already established headings; add qualifiers if needed.

Chart of elements of the SAR.

For the fixed field, the default supplied by the macro is given below. Defaults that may need to be changed are preceded by an asterisk (*), and followed by alternative values. Some of the values are outside of the scope of these guidelines, but are given as an aid to interpreting SARs.

Upd. status	a (record can be used)
Enc lvl	n (complete record)
Source	c (cooperative cataloging)
Roman	Fill character (other codes are used only for Chinese)
Ref status	* n (not applicable) change to “ a ” when adding references (macro supplies “ a ” if references are supplied automatically)
Mod rec	Blank
Name use	a (appropriate as main or added entry)
Govt. agn	Fill character (LC always uses fill character)
Auth status	* a (full) c (provisional) d (preliminary)
Subj	a (LCSH)
Subj use	a (appropriate as subject entry)
Series	* a (monographic series) b (multi-part item) c (series-like phrase) or z (other)
Auth/ref	a (record is for heading not ref)
Geo sub	n (not subdivided geographically)
Ser use	a (appropriate as series entry)
Ser num	* a (numbered) b (unnumbered) or c (numbering varies) (macro supplies a or b)
Name	n (not applicable)
Subdiv.tp.	n (not applicable)
Rules	c (AACR2)
Variable fields:	
010	System supplied
022	International Standard Serial Number
040	System supplied
1XX	Authorized heading
4XX	See from references
5XX	See also from references
642	Series numbering example (for numbered traced series)
643	Imprint
644	Series analysis practice—default f (fully analyzed)
645	Series tracing practice—default t (traced)
646	Series classification practice—default s (classed separately)
670	Source data found