

**Response of the Standing Committee on Training and Recommendations to the
PCC Policy Committee to the
Final Report of the PCC Standing Committee on Training, Task Group on the PCC
Role in Metadata Training:**

The Standing Committee on Training charged the Task Group on the PCC Role in Metadata Training as follows:

- Identify existing and planned descriptive metadata training opportunities (via ALCTS, OCLC, LITA, or other organizations)
- Assess the need in libraries for descriptive metadata training over the near-to-medium term (3-6 years)
- Assess the appropriateness of PCC's involvement in descriptive metadata training. The assessment should articulate how any PCC role would contribute to the Program's mission and goals. It should also weigh the kind of role PCC might play (direct provider of training, advisor to other groups involved in training, etc.)
- If deemed appropriate, recommend a strategy for the PCC to enter the field of descriptive metadata training. The strategy should include:
 - Identification of a target audience (or audiences): front-line professionals, support staff, administrators, or others.
 - Identification of training program subject parameters (i.e., general overviews of descriptive metadata, training in working with one or more specific descriptive metadata schema, etc.)
- Recommend a model for the provision of descriptive metadata training. The recommendation should consider existing models (SCCTP "train-the-trainer" style, ALCTS Metadata Institute, etc.) and/or propose new ones as appropriate.
- Assess and recommend the most effective means of delivering training (in-person, via the Web, teleconferences, etc.)

After many delays, the group issued its final report to the SCT on May 26, 2004. (An earlier draft report had been circulated, discussed and returned, with comments, to Bill Garrison, the TG chair, in January 2004). The SCT discussed the final report during its meeting at ALA, held on June 26, 2004, in Orlando.

In general, the SCT agrees that the TG followed its charge, although the group may have take a narrower approach to the reading of that charge than the SCT chair had envisioned. The Chair takes appropriate responsibility for not providing a more precisely written charge.

The final report recommends that PCC monitor, but not be an active participant in any descriptive metadata training. Among the reasons cited were the mission of PCC, the inability of the program to respond to swift changes in new metadata standards, and the perceived futility of having the Program involved in trying to develop any guidelines for

the use of a given schema. The SCT agrees that the current PCC mission is focused on the creation and sharing of high-quality, AACR2/MARC-based bibliographic and authority records. However, the PCC has recently begun to expand its vision of how best to accomplish that role. To that end, the PCC has become an active collaborator with ALCTS in the development of more generalized cataloger training. One reason the collaboration has been successful is that PCC has many experts in various areas of cataloging who are also skilled trainers, eager to pass on their knowledge to others. We are widely known and sought out for that expertise and those skills.

It is also clear that the future of bibliographic control will extend far beyond traditional library methods of information organization. The recent LC report on “modes of cataloging” and the decision to use MODS more extensively is only one recent example of this burgeoning trend. For PCC to retain its leadership position in the area of information organization, a more active role in setting standards or best practices and in providing support for non-AACR2/MARC metadata may be desirable. The SCT chair formed the Metadata TG in hopes of moving the issue forward for consideration. The chair is aware that significant expertise in non-traditional bibliographic description exists in PCC libraries and that the Program could be well positioned to share this expertise widely.

Recommendations to the Policy Committee:

The Metadata TG does not recommend that PCC become involved in any training activities at this time. The Task Group did recommend that a survey be conducted of PCC libraries to determine where or whether the Program could develop training for the most commonly used standards, and that a new Task Group be appointed to conduct this survey.

The SCT feels that a survey could be useful as a snapshot of where PCC members are in the use of metadata at this time. However, the group also feels that there would be little practical use for the survey results. Instead, the SCT recommends that PoCo consider the role of the Program in providing this kind of training while updating its strategic and tactical plans later this year, and that the PoCo continue to monitor the needs and demands for training in this area. The SCT recommends that PoCo also consider PCC co-sponsorship of metadata training initiatives that arise from the ALCTS Continuing Education Group that is developing training in response to action item 5.3 of the LC Action Plan for Bibliographic Control of Web Resources. A current SCT member, Greta DeGroat, is working with that group. It may be valuable for PCC to be more actively involved in those activities. An example of a course with potential interest is available on that group’s Web site at:

<http://www.library.cornell.edu/cts/alcts/Developer%20Guidelines%20Course%20rev.doc>

However, any such action will be contingent on a clear statement from the Policy Committee regarding its desired role in working with non-traditional methods of bibliographic control.