

Orbis Cascade Alliance

Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)

Final Report – October 1, 2010

CTST Membership:

Mark Watson, Chair, University of Oregon
Michaela Brenner, Portland State University (until July, 2010)
Julie Christerson, Pacific University
Mark Copsey, Walla Walla University
Mark Dahl, Lewis & Clark College
Scott Harrison, Council Liaison, Saint Martin's University
Joe Kiegel, University of Washington
Nancy Nathanson, Staff Liaison, Orbis Cascade Alliance
Jeff Ring, Mt. Hood Community College

Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group:

Joe Kiegel, CTST Liaison, University of Washington
Erica Findley, Pacific University
Mary Greci, University of Oregon
Tom Larsen, Portland State University
Greg Matthews, Washington State University
Bonnie Parks, University of Portland
Friday Valentine, Oregon Health & Science University

Government Documents Working Group:

Julie Christerson, CTST Liaison, Pacific University
Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Claudia Weston, Portland State University

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Technical Service Team (CTST) was charged as follows:

1. Implement a Shared Best Practices working group to develop guidelines for effective technical services policies and operations that support the Alliance goal of a shared ILS;
2. Implement a working group to develop technical services operations that support collaborative cataloging/processing for EBook collections. This working group should coordinate their work with that of the Ebook Team.
3. Implement a core group of libraries committed to a pilot project to organize an exchange of expertise for collaborative cataloging of Difficult Foreign Language Material; and
4. Implement a core group of libraries committed to a pilot project to organize an exchange of expertise for collaborative cataloging and identification of Pre-1976 Federal Documents Holdings in the Alliance.
5. Assess work and recommendations concerning next steps

CTST began its work in December 2009, meeting once in person and on numerous other occasions via video conferencing software or by telephone. The minutes of CTST meetings and working documents of the group are available on the CTST web page:

<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/ctst>.

Conclusions:

Although CTST is pleased to report some forward progress and success in addressing the multiple aspects of its charge, it needs to be stated clearly and emphatically that the obstacles to achieving true collaborative technical services at the consortial level remain formidable.

The most serious barrier to collaborative technical services activity of any kind within the Alliance is the absence of a shared system. One CTST member characterized this common database as the “stake in the ground” for the collaborative tent. Until a shared, integrated library system (ILS) is in place, the vision of a truly collaborative technical services operation remains dim. Complex workarounds are required to fully implement best practices and coordinate centralized activities in an environment where thirty six separate systems require that holdings need to be applied separately in OCLC, the same MARC records need to be downloaded and handled multiple times and authority control proceeds (or not) at the local level. Simply stated, each library has built its own infrastructure to handle technical services in the context of its own ILS, and this represents a major impediment to real collaboration.

Another serious barrier to collaborative technical services is staffing. At the highest levels, the way forward is blocked by a conservatism that holds libraries back from experimenting with new organizational structures—especially those that cross institutional lines. Even for those libraries with a willingness to experiment, collaboration and coordination are difficult because FTE is spread

far and wide across the Alliance. Aggregating this resource defies solution because there is no mechanism for central control and direction. Given any particular task performed in technical services, it is rare to find staff responsibilities deployed in a neatly modular and compartmentalized fashion. The truth is that responsibilities are optimized to fit the local situation, and a given staff member may spend .25 FTE on one activity, .17 FTE on another and so on.

This fragmentation leads to the final barrier to collaborative technical services: incentives are difficult to find. In examining the desire to share and parse out various technical services responsibilities, it is difficult to envision an equitable program—one that does more than simply load more work on a participating library. For example, where language expertise is just adequate to the local need (or less than adequate in the case where backlogs exist), pushback is inevitable if the workload is increased without the input of additional resources.

Given these barriers why should any library participate in an effort to move collaborative technical services forward? Why would enthusiasm be lacking to take on this challenge? These are fair questions, and the answer lies in the rather ageless observation that we are living in the worst of times and the best of times. The economic debacle confronting higher education in general and local institutions in particular suggests, on one hand, that this is the worst time to add weight to any workload. Far from adding staff, libraries are laying people off or leaving vacancies unfilled. Yet as bad as financial situation seems to be it also proves to be the best catalyst for moving us past inertia and into action—taking steps, even if halting, to build a future where we cast our lots together and leverage our strengths.

To this end, CTST offers the following recommendations for Council consideration in hopes that they will be received in a spirit that acknowledges that moving forward is not necessarily a victory over obstacles but rather a necessity in spite of them.

Recommendations:

Shared Best Practices:

- BP1.** Create a cataloging policy group to refine and implement both the immediate and post-shared-ILS recommendations in the Report of the Bibliographic Practices Working Group.
- BP2.** Direct Alliance staff to take an inventory of automated cataloging/acquisitions practices at Alliance institutions and provide a web space for information sharing about practices in this area.

Foreign Language Cataloging:

- FL1.** Create a directory showing where Alliance members can seek assistance in foreign language cataloging.
- FL2.** Implement a pilot project to catalog monographs in Arabic and CJK languages on behalf of Alliance libraries.
- FL3.** Hire a cataloger to provide access to materials on behalf of Alliance libraries.

Cataloging/Processing of Consortial e-books:

- EB1.** Pending approval of the proposal from the EBook Team, retain the services of CTST until such time as recommendations and procedures for cataloging the consortial purchase can be formulated.

Cataloging and Identification of Pre-1976 Federal Documents Holdings:

- GD1.** Refer member libraries to the toolkit contained in the report and allow them to choose the best course of action for their institutions.

Next Steps:

Adoption of the above recommendations, with the exceptions of BP1, BP2 and GD1, will require further work on the part of CTST. Accordingly, the Team anticipates the need for an extension of its charge to complete the work specified in the Recommendations.

Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)

Shared Best Practices

Final Report – 10/1/10

Charge:

Implement a Shared Best Practices working group to develop guidelines for effective technical services policies and operations that support the Alliance goal of a shared ILS.

Background:

To fulfill its charge, CTST first developed a vision of a shared ILS environment by writing up a whitepaper that described such an environment. CTST also made contact with a handful of consortia in the United States that make use of a shared integrated library system. Though CTST discovered some interesting models and practices, none seemed like a model that would match with the needs of the Alliance mainly because of differences in size and mission. Given the uncertainties of a future shared ILS environment, CTST embraced the idea of practices that could be implemented in the current systems environment that would improve existing operations and better position the Alliance for a future shared ILS.

CTST concluded that cataloging would be a fertile area for shared practices because most shared ILS scenarios centralize bibliographic data and because these practices could potentially improve the current Summit/WorldCat environment if implemented now. CTST created a Bibliographic Practices Working Group charged to propose a set of high-level shared bibliographic practices that would facilitate a future move to a shared ILS. The group was made up of staff from Alliance libraries that are highly knowledgeable in cataloging and database maintenance. This group published the report below with recommendations in two areas: those that can be implemented before a shared ILS is in place and those that would need to be implemented after such a system is in place. Notably, the report also recommends the creation of a "cataloging policy group" to refine and implement both the immediate and post-shared-ILS recommendations.

Finally, in an increasingly YBP-centric acquisitions environment, many libraries are adopting similar practices with regards to acquisitions and automated cataloging via WorldCat Cataloging Partners. CTST believes that the adoption of similar practices in this environment could lead to greater efficiencies in Alliance libraries technical services operations and that alignment in these workflows could promote easier Alliance-wide migrations to future acquisitions systems. Thus, CTST recommends that the Alliance staff take an inventory of automated cataloging/acquisitions practices at Alliance institutions and provide a web space for information sharing about practices in this area.

Report of the Bibliographic Practices Working Group

September 22, 2010

Introduction

The group started with the assumption that a shared ILS is in place. That is, it did not consider migration issues (e.g., how to get call numbers from various fields in Alliance local systems into a single field in a shared ILS). As the Alliance approaches the implementation of an ILS, separate consideration will need to be given to the question of migration.

The Working Group identified fourteen areas for shared practices with regard to bibliographic records in an Alliance shared ILS. Discussion is necessarily at a high level, with a goal of documenting areas for shared practices rather than exploring them in depth. Each topic is briefly described, and in some cases an alternative course of action is provided, along with the pros and cons. Recommendations are made for many topics, although the refrained from recommendations in areas that cannot be implemented until the shared ILS is in place. The report concludes with recommendations on the time frame for implementing these areas of shared practice.

Bibliographic Utility

All Alliance libraries must catalog using the same bibliographic utility (e.g. OCLC) in order to promote shared cataloging and make the most efficient use of records from outside the Alliance. Currently, all Alliance libraries catalog on OCLC. New members of the Alliance must catalog using the same bibliographic utility. If a decision is made to change utility, then Alliance members should all move together.

Recommendation: The Alliance should continue to catalog using a single bibliographic utility.

Floor Bibliographic Standards

In a shared environment, all catalogers must create cataloging records that meet a floor level of completeness. Such a floor level is needed to facilitate shared cataloging, and catalogers may go above the floor. There are two broad options for deciding on floor bibliographic standards:

- Adopt existing national standards:

There will be multiple standards because of the needs of different bibliographic formats. In some cases, choices must be made, e.g. OCLC Full vs PCC BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) for monographs. The effect of Resource Description and Access (RDA) needs to be taken into account.

Pro: less costly to develop, maintain, train and carry out; interoperability with other software is better; migration to another ILS is easier

Con: less flexible and likely to require the elimination of more local practices

- Develop Alliance standards:

An Orbis Cascade standard would need to be compatible with national standards, so that records could be contributed to OCLC, but local practices agreed at the Alliance level could be allowed in the shared ILS.

Pro: more flexible and may provide the opportunity to accommodate more local practices

Con: more costly to develop, maintain, train and carry out; less likely to easily work with other software and systems

Recommendation: Adopt existing national standards for floor bibliographic standards in the Alliance.

Network Level Cataloging

The Alliance must have a policy on network level cataloging, that is, whether new catalog records and edits to cataloging copy are done in the bibliographic utility (e.g. OCLC WorldCat), or whether some new records and edits are made only in the shared ILS. The situation with OCLC authorizations and the ability to edit records is complex, and some libraries will not be able to change every format. There may be ways to work around limitations by using funnel projects or by creating networks within the Alliance.

Pro: supports WorldCat Local

Con: not all Alliance libraries may be able to do it

Recommendation: Alliance libraries should do as much cataloging as they can at the network level. In addition, we should push to do more by working with OCLC to remove restrictions, e.g. by lifting restrictions on record replacement for serials.

Level of PCC Contribution

A decision must be made about the extent of contributions to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Currently, some libraries contribute to some or all of the PCC programs (CONSER, BIBCO, NACO, SACO), while other libraries do not. The PCC is a model of cooperation and collaboration whereby costs are shared and high quality cataloging records are produced and shared widely. Does the Alliance want to increase its level of contribution? Should additional training be provided to libraries, or should the Alliance establish funnel programs? If funnel programs are set up, how are costs and staffing supported? Are costs and staffing shared by the institution hosting the funnel, or are they shared among Alliance libraries?

Recommendation: The Alliance should maintain its current level of PCC contribution and strive to do more (e.g., by supporting training in PCC programs within the Alliance).

Single vs Separate Records

A shared practice for using single or separate records for multiple formats of the same title (i.e. print and electronic) must be established. Currently, some Alliance libraries use separate records, while others combine print, electronic and even microform holdings on one bibliographic record. At the very least, any bibliographic record with holdings from two or more libraries must be handled consistently: it does not make sense to have separate records and a single-record approach for any given title at the same time. We need to analyze and choose one of these options.

- Consistent single records:

This is not really a viable option, because it is much less expensive to load records for large sets than to attempt to add them manually to existing print records.

- Consistent separate records:

This approach is simple and often works best at the national level, e.g. with WorldCat Local. However, it may be costly to create separate records in every case (e.g., for monographs with full text available for free on the Web).

- Mixed environment:

Is it possible to have a mix of single and separate records in a shared environment? Coordination of cataloging and loading activity is an issue. At the very least, each bibliographic record should be treated only one way, and not both. Whatever choice is made, a shared practice should be applied from that point in time forward as the consortium probably cannot afford a retrospective conversion of older records.

Recommendation: Recognizing the current reality of a mixed environment, the Alliance should not attempt retrospective conversion to obtain a consistent approach. Rather the Alliance should create separate records from a chosen point forward.

Vendor Neutral Records

The Alliance must decide on policies regarding vendor neutral records for electronic resources. National practice requires their use in OCLC, but there is the option of maintaining separate records in the local catalog. It is possible to provide added entries for publishers or aggregators in the local catalog, which are not allowed in the national record.

Pro: added entries provide additional staff and user access to electronic resources

Con: separate records or added entries are extra work and are more difficult to maintain

Recommendation: Alliance libraries should use vendor neutral records without additional local added entries.

Local Information

The Alliance must decide what to do with information local to an individual library. Most local information in the bibliographic record cannot be done in a shared ILS. However, there is a continuing need to support local information. Much of it is driven by bibliographic requirements (e.g. notes on missing pages, or bindings for materials in special collections) or by requirements coming from outside technical services (e.g. donor information). Another example of legitimate local information is a processing note, often stored in field 910 (or another 9XX field), which allows record sets to be gathered using Create Lists. Another example is coding needed to compile statistics, e.g. ARL statistics, or statistical information used for accreditation reviews. Local variation in call number schemes is allowable, as long as call numbers are stored in the same field (e.g. an item record). It is clear that in a shared ILS there must be a single practice for handling each type of local information, that is, all libraries should put the same kind of information in the same place. Other record types than the bibliographic record may be candidates for storing this information: item records, checkin records, order records, and ERM records. How this is done depends strongly on the specific ILS system chosen by the Alliance.

Local Inventory Control

Policies must be determined on how to handle local inventory of non-bibliographic materials (e.g., room keys, laptops, and other things that are controlled and circulated through the ILS).

Outsourcing

Guidelines for use of third-party cataloging vendors (e.g., OCLC Contract Cataloging) must be developed. It is not a requirement that all Alliance libraries use the same one, but every vendor must meet minimum standards. The Alliance could develop a list of screening criteria for choosing a vendor.

Recommendation: While Alliance libraries are free to choose vendors according to their needs, vendor records added to the shared catalog must meet Alliance standards.

Authority Work

Alliance libraries must decide on a strategy for authority control in a shared ILS. Whatever level of authority control is maintained, all libraries should follow the same practices. That is, it makes no sense to continue the mix of approaches in practice now, where some libraries perform authority control entirely in-house and others send records to one or another vendor.

Alliance libraries must choose which of these broad options that they wish to adopt:

- Do no systematic authority control:

Even if there is no authority control in the shared ILS, a good deal of authority work must be done in original cataloging and copy cataloging contributed at the national level (Enhance) in order to meet national standards.

- Do authority control exclusively in house:

In this case, Alliance catalogers and maintenance staff perform all aspects of authority control.

- Use a third-party vendor to support authority control:

In this scenario, a vendor supplies services that are used in conjunction with authority checking during cataloging and maintenance procedures in the ILS database. Clearly, a single vendor must be used, and the sending of records should be centralized so that it is done for all Alliance libraries together.

Recommendation: The Alliance should maintain authority control in the shared database, and use a third-party vendor to support it.

Batch Loading

Batch loading of bibliographic records and associated holdings must be coordinated in a shared ILS. That is, creating duplicate bibliographic records when multiple libraries purchase the same set is not a good practice. There is also the possibility of cataloging sets cooperatively (e.g., when the Alliance purchases them). Preference for record sets available from OCLC is a good policy, since this facilitates matching through the OCLC number and simplifies setting holdings in OCLC. However, OCLC records are not always available or are not always available quickly, and decisions must be made on what should be done when only third-party records can be had: currently some libraries load them and others do not. Also, a library may create and load MARC records based on vendor supplied information rather than a record set (e.g., by converting information in a spreadsheet).

Another area for coordination is the use of OCLC PromptCat (WorldCat Cataloging Partners) as well as vendor bibliographic files as part of the acquisitions process. This coordination includes criteria for accepting records, standardized data mappings and overlay keys. There may be a need to coordinate approval plans or other acquisitions policies to make these loads workable. Another aspect of this topic is bibliographic records supplied by holding maintenance services such as Serials Solutions. In a shared ILS, it makes sense to use a single vendor.

Database Management

There must be a plan for managing and maintaining the shared bibliographic file. This includes apportioning responsibilities (e.g. central vs distributed), establishing channels of communication, and coordinating maintenance activities with policies for new title cataloging. Uniform practices are needed for such things as withdrawn titles, suppressed records, etc.

Cataloging Policy Group

In order to sustain shared bibliographic practices over time, the Alliance must have a group responsible for developing and maintaining cataloging policy. Perhaps, if there is a central group for database management, it could play an important role in policy development.

Training

The Alliance must have a plan and support for cataloging training. A move to shared bibliographic practices will mean changes for all Alliance libraries, and many will need help making these changes. In addition, staff turnover, and some libraries may lack the resources to train new staff members.

Time Frame for Implementation of Shared Practices

Some of these areas of shared practice may be implemented before a shared ILS is acquired, while others are better done closer to the implementation of the ILS. In this section CTST makes recommendations on the time frame for each area of practice. Early implementation of some shared practices will address current problems in Summit. For example, a policy on single vs. separate records, and to a lesser extent a policy on vendor neutral records, addresses the problem of Summit holdings on separate OCLC records. A policy on network level cataloging addresses the problem of some local cataloging information not appearing in Summit.

Implementation may begin before a shared ILS is in place:

- Floor Bibliographic Standards
- Network Level Cataloging
- Level of PCC Contribution
- Single vs. Separate Records
- Vendor Neutral Records
- Outsourcing

Cannot be implemented until a shared ILS is chosen or in place:

- Local Information
- Local Inventory Control
- Authority Work
- Batch Loading
- Database Management

Implementation depends on the timing of the implementation of other areas:

- Cataloging Policy Group
- Training

**Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)
Difficult Foreign Language Cataloging
Final Report – 10/1/10**

Charge:

Implement a pilot project to organize an exchange of expertise for collaborative cataloging of Difficult Foreign Language Material.

Results:

CTST approached this aspect of its charge by undertaking a survey to identify the type and extent of foreign language cataloging in the Alliance; the amount of FTE devoted to such activity and the amount of additional cataloging capacity that may exist among member libraries. The results of the survey (<http://tinyurl.com/2ewjuxx>) led CTST to the following conclusions:

- Language and cataloging expertise exists within the Alliance to provide bibliographic control for materials in all of the most common foreign languages
- The amount of FTE devoted to foreign language cataloging is highly diffused among member libraries
- Minimal capacity exists within the Alliance to absorb additional foreign language cataloging

Discussion:

One CTST member described the results of the survey as akin to looking at shattered glass—little bits and pieces of FTE scattered around with no obvious unifying theme or pattern. Although disappointing to the Team, it was necessary to acknowledge that, while member libraries were finding ways to meet local cataloging needs, they possessed little or no capacity to catalog materials for other libraries.

On the surface, it seems obvious that efficiency lies in the direction of centralizing cataloging activities. However, aggregating labor to achieve this goal is fraught with obstacles, not the least of which is the fact that the expertise for foreign language cataloging is highly Balkanized. For example, one FTE cataloger may divide their time between several, if not half a dozen languages. Additionally, figuring out how to amalgamate the bits and pieces runs up against the geographic dispersion of the FTE itself.

Recommendations:

Despite fragmentation of cataloging FTE, CTST believes that there are several steps that can be taken in this area:

1. The results of the survey suggest the creation of a directory for the use of Alliance members in seeking assistance with foreign language cataloging. Even if the capacity to

perform the actual cataloging for other libraries is highly constrained, the directory can provide members with information about where they might turn for consultation and advice. **Recommendation:** Create a directory showing where Alliance members can seek assistance in foreign language cataloging.

2. To make incremental gains in this area and take some next steps towards collaboration, a pilot project should be implemented. The University of Washington and the University of Oregon propose to assume responsibility for cataloging materials in selected foreign languages on behalf of Alliance libraries. UW will offer copy cataloging of Arabic language monographs. UO will offer copy and original cataloging of Chinese, Japanese and Korean (CJK) monographs. In establishing the pilot, it will be necessary to:

1. Work around separate OCLC cataloging authorizations
2. Work out the logistics of moving materials back and forth
3. Establish cataloging standards
4. Create a timeline for the pilot and conduct an assessment
5. Set aside some local activities in order to make progress on behalf of the consortium

To be gained from the pilot will be the experience of moving toward greater consortial cooperation and insights into what is involved in forming the core of a collaborative technical services operation. Hopefully, the Alliance will gain a greater understanding of what needs to happen at the consortial level. It may be that some combination of local, consortial and/or outsourced approaches will ultimately emerge as the best solution.

Recommendation: Implement a pilot project to catalog monographs in Arabic and CJK languages on behalf of Alliance libraries.

3. As stated in the Executive Summary, a serious barrier to realizing collaborative technical services is the fragmented staffing spread across the geographic region of the Alliance. CTST recommends that the Alliance take a bold step towards overcoming this problem.

To avoid the inevitable problems and difficulties raised by the prospect of re-allocating or re-locating staff, CTST believes that the Alliance should fund a 1.0 FTE cataloger position. The funds to support this position could be levied from the libraries that expect to use central cataloging services or they could be spread across the entire membership. For example, the capacity to catalog cartographic materials is in short supply across the Alliance. Making a hire to pick up expertise in this area could lead to vastly increased access to maps in all formats. The position will also represent a tangible step towards collaborating in a key area of technical services across institutional boundaries.

Recommendation: Hire a cataloger to provide access to materials on behalf of Alliance libraries.

Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)
EBook Cataloging
Progress Report – 10/1/10

Charge:

Implement a working group to develop technical services operations that support collaborative cataloging/processing for EBook collections. This working group should coordinate their work with that of the EBook Team.

Discussion:

On page thirteen of the EBook report to Council, the group states that, “Cataloging and access issues, including representation in local catalogs and WorldCat, proxy access, and removal of catalog records are complex.” CTST concurs with this assessment and looks forward to a continuing collaboration in order to address these issues. The questions that need to be answered have been identified (see below). What remains is the need to work with EBL and OCLC to develop workflow and procedures.

Recommendation:

Pending approval of the proposal from the EBook Team, retain the services of CTST until such time as recommendations and procedures for cataloging the consortial purchase can be formulated.

**Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)
Cataloging of Pre-1976 Federal Government Documents
Final Report – 10/1/10**

Charge:

Implement a core group of libraries committed to a pilot project to organize an exchange of expertise for collaborative cataloging and identification of Pre-1976 Federal Government Documents holdings in the Alliance.

Discussion with Government Documents Work Group:

After contacting the document librarians in depository libraries which are members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance and receiving a meager reply, CTST member, Julie Christerson attended the April 30, 2010 meeting of the Documents Interest Group of Oregon (DIGOR) in Salem, OR. There, Arlene Weible of the Oregon State Library and Claudia Weston of Portland State University agreed to become members of a Government Documents Working Group and meet with the CTST member to further discuss this charge. Material was sent to them on this topic and a meeting was held May 14th at PSU. Alex Toth of Pacific University also attended this meeting. It was immediately agreed that this herculean task would need to be broken up into manageable sections. Several popular government sets were discussed as a starting point (Area Wage Surveys, Labor Bulletins, United States Geological Survey publications for example) and after much discussion, it was suggested that a survey of small depository libraries in the consortia would be helpful to determine which of the Pre-1976 publications should be considered the most useful to all depositories and therefore should be tackled first. It was decided to concentrate on small depositories as the larger depositories have more staff and resources; the smaller depositories are often a one person department who can work on depository projects on a part time basis. The group unanimously agreed that Committee Hearings would most likely be the candidate. Other topics discussed were what would be the minimum standard for the record, would a geographic focus make sense and is this a good opportunity to “showcase” under-utilized sets? It was decided to contact Karen Highum of the University of Washington to gather more information how on UW has progressed in their Pre-1976 cataloging project.

Discussion with Laurie Beyer Hall, Director, Library Technical Information Services, Government Printing Office

Ms. Hall was contacted via email on April 7th of this year. She described GPO’s current project of creating brief bib records created from the Pre-1976 Historic Shelf list collection. She emphasized they do not have the book in hand so it could not be called a retrospective conversion project. This project will end May 2011 and the pace has been incredibly slow. At the time we conversed in April, only 4,500 out of 600,000 records had been converted. Also, they will not be loaded into OCLC.

Discussion with Karen Highum, Head Database Management Section and Authorities Librarian, University of Washington

An email discussion was begun with Ms. Highum in early May of this year. She shared that UW began their Pre-1976 cataloging project in 2002. They organized the project by range and systematically went through each one. The first step was to check OCLC for records (a truck load of documents at a time) and if a record was found, they used it. If not found they input a brief bib for the item. When UW began using Worldcat Local as their catalog, those records had to be sent to OCLC to be assigned OCLC accession numbers and be loaded into the system. They also began to add their holdings to the GPO records they received from Marcive. They are nearly finished with this project and should be congratulated for their diligence.

Research Material:

- 2000 Report of Orbis' Government Documents Task Force, Tom Stave, chair.
- Cataloging Pre-1976 U.S. Government Publications: Stakeholders and Strategies Summary presented at the 1998 ALA Midwinter Conference by the Government Documents Round Table (GODART) Cataloging Committee, Arlene Weible, chair.
- 1998-2000 Historical Government Documents Cataloging Project: The Five Colleges of Ohio, Ellen Conrad, coordinator. Various documents.

Toolkit:

A library survey was not conducted at this time. Instead it was decided to concentrate on Committee Hearings as the priority set. Several options as to how the consortia could proceed in instituting a Pre-1976 Federal Government Documents Cataloging Project were discussed by the various constituents. The possible choices are as follows:

- 1 Have OCLC create a new Government Document Record set limited to the Y4s (Committee Hearings) for the consortia members. One could then attach their holdings to these records.
- 2 Purchase a product such as LexisNexis who offers MARC records for their Hearings Digital Collection. Member libraries could then use the base record for the corresponding print hearing. These records not only have SuDoc numbers but have (or will soon have) OCLC numbers and are (or soon will be) part of the OCLC database.
- 3 Jennie Burroughs, the regional depository librarian for Montana who is at the University of Montana has created a wiki for the cataloging of Pre-76 documents. (<http://pre76docs.pbwiki.com>) As she comments on the front page, Libraries have been working on cataloging federal government information for so long, that there are now available records for the vast majority of items. While some original cataloging is still needed (for under 5% of items), most work on cataloging pre-1976 federal publications involves copy cataloging, using records found through OCLC. Her wiki is an organizational

and collaborative tool whose premise/template could be borrowed by the consortia or the consortia could work with her on this current list, especially in the Y4s. Consortia members could then batch attach their holdings in OCLC and download records from OCLC into our OPACS.

- 4 Work with the University of Washington in a similar way. Ms. Weston mentioned that as a test Ms. Highum from UW sent PSU a spreadsheet containing the 086, OCLC#, 245#a, and 008_date_one data for about 9900 records extracted from UW's local catalog. PSU added its unique records to the list. Other consortia institutions could compile similar lists to merge into a central list that would be shared.

Recommendation:

CTST's recommendation is to refer member libraries to the above toolkit and allow them to choose the best course of action for their institutions. If a consortial purchase is needed, CTST recommends that the Electronic Resources Committee look further into this matter. The records are available, most through OCLC (as Ms. Burroughs notes above). Not every library in the consortia is a depository library. However, all would benefit from access to the pre-1976 collection. Of the four options mentioned above, the first two would require a purchase, whether it is consortia or an individual library. The last two could be implemented by an individual library.

Epilogue:

On September 22, 2010 the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) launched their new FDLP Modeling project website. (<http://www.fdlpmodeling.net>) Some of the questions addressed by the new project include:

- How are libraries working to preserve content for posterity, in print and digital form, and what challenges do they face in doing so?
- What challenges to the continued sustainability of the FDLP have been identified, and what solutions have been proposed over the years?
- What has been the impact of these challenges on FDLP as a preservation and service network? How are the efforts of GPO, the broader government, and a variety of commercial and non-commercial players reshaping the landscape for government information publishing and access?

So perhaps GPO will once again address the problem of making it easier to access Pre-1976 Federal Government Documents MARC records via the depository program