

Report of the Levels of Cataloguing Task Group

September 16, 1996

The library's database should be the bedrock of service to its users. Essentially, productive use of a database involves the expenditure of time--time spent by a librarian at the beginning of the process to save time for thousands of potential users, or time spent by those thousands of users at the end of the process as they seek to make sense of incoherent or even random bibliographic records.

Michael Gorman, Dean of Library Services, California State University, Fresno
(Gorman 1995, p. 33-4)

I believe that putting the full force of our human and electronic resources behind ensuring that patrons get the information they need is far more important than futile, unrealistic efforts to achieve perfect and precise descriptions of the physical books residing on our shelves.

Ellen Waite, Vice President for Academic Services and University Librarian, Loyola University (Waite 1995, p. 37)

The library's revised cataloguing levels are intended to reduce processing time, keep cataloguing as consistent and current as possible, ensure continuing access to materials, minimize backlogs, and address the problem of severely reduced resources.

National Library of Canada (Feliciter 42:5 (1996): 22)

Foreword

At the end of May 1995, the University Librarian established a Levels of Cataloguing Task Group (LCTG) whose purpose was to establish criteria for levels of cataloguing, including other listing options short of cataloguing, in order to ensure that library materials are made available quickly. The intent was to review earlier reports concerning levels of cataloguing, consider practices both in the Catalogue Division and in reference divisions and branch libraries, and to develop standard guidelines and procedures which would apply to the whole Library system. To ensure that there was input from a wide range of librarians, the Task Group included both cataloguers and reference librarians as well as representatives from the Library Administration.

The LCTG met regularly during the past year. It reviewed earlier studies at the UBC Library, reports and documentation from national authorities and academic libraries, and pertinent articles in the literature, as well as information obtained through selected site visits. Based on this review and its own discussions, it developed a draft report which was made available to librarians and staff. The report was discussed at two public staff meetings, a meeting with cataloguing staff, and at meetings of the Library Planning and Management Council and the Library Administration. Comments and suggestions were encouraged, and these as well as other contributions from individual staff members have been extremely helpful in shaping and modifying the final version of the report and its recommendations. In addition, this feedback will be of great assistance to those who will implement the LCTG's recommendations.

Task Group Membership

The Task Group consisted of: Susan Andrews, Cataloguing Division; Nadine Baldwin, AUL Technical Processes; Diana Cooper, Fine Arts Library (until March 1996); Erik de Bruijn, AUL Human Resources and Staff Development (Chair); Joyce Friesen, Head, Collections Accounting and Budget; Jocelyn Godolphin, Head, HSS Division; Peggy McBride, Fine Arts

Library (until March 1996); Nick Omelusik, Head, Catalogue Division; Brian Owen, Systems Manager; Margaret Price, Head, Life Sciences Libraries.

Terms of Reference

The Task Group was given the following terms of reference:

1. Review the recommendations of the Processing Implementation Group discussion papers #2 and #3 as they relate to levels of cataloguing, including other bibliographic listings short of cataloguing. Develop standard guidelines and procedures across the system.
2. Make a recommendation on the principle of accepting catalogue copy as is. List exceptions.
3. Review processing work flow options in relation to changes in our processing systems and Library restructuring.
4. Reduce duplication of effort in creating bibliographic records for ordering, cataloguing and other purposes.
5. Reduce expense of bibliographic records or hold the line on their costs by purchasing or creating only once, by exploring availability from book vendors or other sources at no or low cost.
6. Review developments at other libraries.
7. Comment on negative and positive impacts and anticipated savings for reallocations.

Summary of Principles and Recommendations

Principles

The Library affirms the utility to its users of the systematic organization and arrangement of information in all formats.

The Library ensures that acquired materials are made available to its users as quickly as possible.

The Library recognizes that provision of consistent and understandable access points to accurate bibliographic information about the Library's collections facilitates the work of students and faculty and thus enhances teaching, study, and research.

The Library recognizes the added value to its user community of the work performed by catalogue librarians and cataloguing support staff.

Recommendations

The Bibliographic File

1. *That all bibliographic records for local holdings reside in a single file. If required or appropriate, different encoding levels may be assigned to reflect the distinctions currently maintained by storing bibliographic records in separate local files.*

Levels of Cataloguing

2. *That the Library adopt three levels of cataloguing - Level 3, Level 2, and Level 1- for materials added to its collection.*

Record Creation and Maintenance

3. *That appropriately trained staff throughout the Library, including a mix of both cataloguing and public services staff, be able to create, upgrade or augment bibliographic information in Level 3 and Level 2 records.*

4. *That record creation/maintenance standards for the three levels of cataloguing be developed, applied, and adhered to throughout the Library system.*

5. *That in order to support the distribution of bibliographic record creation and maintenance, the completion of recon and the resulting creation of an electronic shelflist be given a high priority.*

Record Quality and Editing

6. *That error checking should be limited as much as possible to a visual comparison of editing template data elements in the record with data provided in the item being processed.*

Record Augmentation and Upgrading

7. *That the Library use the services of bibliographic utilities to periodically upgrade locally-created Level 3 and Level 2 records to national standards.*

Authority Control

8. *That local authority control be limited to Level 2 and Level 1 records where appropriate, and that the Library make periodic use of the services of bibliographic utilities to provide derived authority data.*

Cataloguing Workflow

9. *That there be no delay in processing materials in order to wait for the appearance of catalogue copy.*

10. *That appropriate processing turn-around times be developed, communicated, implemented, and evaluated by staff and management responsible for this activity.*

Application of Levels of Cataloguing to Library Materials

11. *That most materials in the Library's collection initially receive no more than Level 2 cataloguing or catalogue copy checking, and that Level 1 cataloguing be reserved for reference and specialized materials such as those relating to British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest, or for materials for which the Library has agreed to provide Level 1 cataloguing as part of a cooperative shared cataloguing agreement.*

Classification and Shelf Designation

12. *That the 'I' shelving designation be discontinued, and that materials in this designation be reviewed for retention, and either discarded or classified appropriately.*

13. *That wherever possible, classification procedures for specific categories of materials be structured and codified, and that support staff be trained to perform such classification work.*

14. *That bibliographic records for materials which do not warrant classification provide location and access information, and that the storage and arrangement of such materials in a manner to facilitate self-service be controlled by the branch or division where the material is located.*

Integration of Record Creation and Ordering/Receipt Functions

15. *That the Head, Catalogue Division and the Head, Order Division, evaluate the implications of integrating certain bibliographic record creation functions with ordering/receipt procedures.*

Decentralization of Cataloguing

16. *That where warranted by the volume of work, cataloguers and cataloguing support staff work in branches or divisions for which they provide specialized cataloguing services in terms of subject, language, or material format, and that the Library provide them with the necessary space and facilities to carry out their responsibilities.*

Training and Coordination

17. *That a Cataloguing Liaison Group be established to address, resolve, and communicate cataloguing standards, procedures, and other cataloguing-related issues for the Library system.*

18. *That a Cataloguing Unit be assigned operational responsibility for system-wide training, documentation, conformance to standards, and overall coordination.*

Sources of Bibliographic Information and Cooperative Cataloguing

19. *That the Library continue to create and contribute original records for unique local resources which support teaching and research priorities at the University, and for materials in areas where it has cataloguing staff with specialized subject and language skills as part of cooperative cataloguing arrangements.*

20. *That the AUL for Technical Services and the Head, Catalogue Division, determine productivity and cost statistics for cataloguing and related processing activities in order to evaluate the effectiveness of locally-initiated changes in work procedures and to compare the Library's cost-effectiveness to that of vendor-provided services.*

Exceptions and Local Practices

21. *That aside from the exceptions listed below, the Library follow current LC/NLC/NLM practice for classification and cataloguing, adopting the principle of accepting catalogue copy as is wherever possible, with verification only of the data elements appropriate to the level of cataloguing assigned to the item being processed.*

Canadian Literature

22. *That the Library continue the practice of NLC in using the PS8000-8500 range for new Canadian literary authors, and plan for the reclassification of established numbers for earlier authors as a one-time project.*

Commonwealth English-language Literature

23. *That the Library continue its current use of a local expansion for classifying the works of Commonwealth English-language authors other than Canadian until all Canadian authors are reclassified into PS8000-8500.*

Children's Literature

24. *That with the exception of English language picture books of less than 32 pages, the Library abandon its in-house classification for children's and juvenile literature and follow the current practice of LC for all newly-acquired material.*

Law

25. *That the Library continue the use of the Moys classification for law, not changing to the LC K schedule until funding is available to permit the completion of a one-time reclassification project.*

Photography as Art

26. *That the Library cease classifying materials on photography as art in NH, follow LC practice in classifying them in TR, and give some priority to reclassifying the NH collection.*

Canadian History

27. *That the Library continue to follow NLC practice in classifying materials on Canadian history in FC, and plan a one-time project to reclassify remaining items in the old Canadian history range once RECON is completed.*

Medicine

28. *That the Library continue to follow NLM practice in classifying medical and related materials.*

29. *That the Library continue the use of NLM subject headings for medical materials*

Bibliographies

30. *That the Library abandon the use of compound Z numbers for bibliographies and use the LC topical classification numbers.*

Microforms

31. *That the Library continue with the use of the AW classification for microforms as a shelving tool.*

Colbeck Collection

32. *That the Library abandon the special classification for the Colbeck Collection, and follow current UBC practice for literary authors added to the Collection. The classification of earlier materials would not be changed.*

Non-standard Author Numbers

33. *That the Library continue with its current practice in maintaining already established non-standard numbers for English-language authors but changing to LC's number for European authors when the Library holds five works or less by the author concerned.*

New Editions

34. *That the Library abandon the practice of changing classification numbers to keep editions together.*

Monographs in Series

35. *That the Library follow the practice of LC in classifying monographs in numbered series as monographs or as a collection.*

Music Scores and Sound Recordings

36. *That the Library continue to use uniform titles for cataloguing music materials*

37. *That the Library abandon the in-house classification scheme for the Wilson Recordings Collection and use a modified version of the Music Library's classification system for sound recordings throughout the Library.*

38. *That the Library adopt the use of the MARC format for cataloguing sound recordings.*

39. *That the classification of a sound recording be determined by the composer of the first cut, and that the number of added entries and subject headings be governed by the level of cataloguing assigned to the recording.*

40. *That the backlog of uncatalogued sound recordings be promptly processed, making full use of derivative copy where available and otherwise catalogued at Level 3*

Uniform Titles

41. *That except where supported by national authorities and clearly facilitating access for users, the Library cease the use of uniform titles, replacing this use with additional subject headings or keyword access to notes, although uniform titles provided in source/derivative copy will not be deleted.*

Theses

42. *That access to UBC theses be provided through the use of unnumbered controlled series headings which group theses by year, faculty, and department.*

43. *That all UBC doctoral dissertations receive at least Level 2 cataloguing, except that those in the sciences and those which are original creative works in the humanities and social sciences do not require subject headings.*

44. *That all UBC dissertations and master's theses in subjects outside the sciences receive at least Level 2 cataloguing if the topic is Canadian or written in a foreign language, or if they have non-descriptive titles.*

Maps

45. That the Head, Special Collections/Fine Arts/University Archives/Map Library and the Head, Catalogue Division, review the procedures for cataloguing maps in order to integrate them with those used for other materials.

Error Correction

46. That most errors, whether in bibliographic records or in the labelling of materials, be corrected promptly by trained divisional/branch staff, and that users reporting such errors are appropriately thanked.

Implementation

47. That the University Librarian appoint a project team with the mandate to complete the implementation of the recommendations of this report by May 1, 1997.

Cataloguing at the UBC Library

Introduction

The foresight of UBC's first University Librarian, John Ridington, in choosing the Library of Congress classification and subject heading system laid the foundation for the systematic organization and arrangement of the Library's collections. Over the years, successive generations of cataloguers and cataloguing support staff have worked hard to provide comprehensive and consistent access to the vast array of information which the Library holds, facilitating the teaching, research, and study carried out at UBC. Cataloguing staff have demonstrated willingness and ingenuity in streamlining processing operations and in adopting innovative approaches. In-house production of catalogue cards, the use of NUC and shared cataloguing copy, the early adoption of the MARC standard for bibliographic records, the COM catalogue, the use of bibliographic utilities such as UTLAS, OCLC, and RLIN, participation in the development of the local online catalogue and in the process for selecting a new vendor-provided system - all these are evidence that cataloguing staff have attempted to make best use of available resources and new technology in order to ensure that the Library's users have both bibliographic and physical access to newly-acquired materials as soon as possible. At the same time, cataloguing staff have worked closely with public services staff to ensure that the application of both classification and subject headings has met the needs not only of contemporary but of future users as well.

Today, the pressures of reduced budgets, increased user expectations, rapidly-changing technology, and a plethora of electronic information resources are affecting all academic libraries. Technical services in general and cataloguing in particular are not immune from the effects of these forces. It is clear that librarians and users would prefer the best and most complete bibliographic records. Yet the production of a record can cost as much as the item it describes. The resources needed to maintain the catalogue must be balanced with those needed for collections and services. Reduced budgets translate into fewer staff, and with an increased demand for mediated services which the current growth of electronic resources implies, there is a growing tendency for library administrators to reallocate staff from technical services to public services, placing their trust in technology to solve the problems of bibliographic control and access, or obtaining bibliographic information from other sources. For example, Waite has identified the priorities of academic libraries as to "1) Answer as many of the information needs of our community as possible through direct service; 2) acquire as many resources as necessary to do this; and 3) be in the forefront of the developing electronic information infrastructure," and

she questions the utility to the user of subject headings and even the classification (Waite, 1995, p. 37).

On the other hand, Gorman sees bibliographic control as central to the work of reference librarians, citing the interdependence of public services librarians and cataloguers. "How can a reference librarian function effectively without coherent, systematic bibliographic control? How can cataloging be justified if there is no one to interpret the organization of knowledge to the library's users?" (Gorman, 1995, p.32) Both Waite and Gorman agree, however, that there is an important role for cataloguers to play in making sense out of the chaos of electronic information, and that cataloguers can contribute significantly to direct public services (Waite 1995, p. 37; Gorman 1995, p. 33-4). UBC Library cataloguers and cataloguing support staff have a continuing history of such participation in the Library's information and reference services.

In a review of the cataloguing literature, Ruschoff identified a series of cost-cutting or innovative measures which could lead to increased cataloguing productivity (Ruschoff 1995, p. 52). These fell into four categories:

- 1) streamlining cataloguing through curtailing procedures and simplifying standards;
- 2) sharing cataloguing through cooperative enterprise;
- 3) obtaining cataloguing through contracting schemes;
- 4) automating cataloguing through artificial intelligence or expert systems.

While the latter is of great long-term interest, current developments are only at a very preliminary state, and do not promise immediate solutions. In addressing its terms of reference, the LCTG has therefore focused on the first three categories.

Within the context of the Library's Strategic Plan and in keeping with the Library's Statement of Values, the LCTG supports the following general principles in regard to the UBC Library's bibliographic database and the work of cataloguers and cataloguing support staff.

The Library affirms the utility to its users of the systematic organization and arrangement of information in all formats.

The Library ensures that acquired materials are made available to its users as quickly as possible.

The Library recognizes that the provision of consistent and understandable access points to accurate bibliographic information about the Library's collections facilitates the work of students and faculty and thus enhances teaching, study, and research.

The Library recognizes the added value to its user community of the work performed by catalogue librarians and cataloguing support staff.

The Bibliographic File

For online inquiry purposes, UBCLIB has been consolidating local bibliographic records from multiple local files (CATalogue, Recon (OLD), Serials bibliographic, Miscellaneous, Course Orders, CIHM, Microlog) into a single file since 1992. Local holdings now include some electronic materials. As the Library proceeds with implementation of the new DRA system, these separate files must be physically consolidated into one file. The following recommendation is thus a statement of fact as well as a desired objective.

1. That all bibliographic records for local holdings reside in a single file. If required or appropriate, different encoding levels may be assigned to reflect the distinctions currently maintained by storing bibliographic records in separate local files.

Levels of Cataloguing

The Library's catalogue has served both as a finding tool and a bibliography of the Library's collection. Yet in neither respect has it been complete or comprehensive. Certain categories of materials such as journal articles and vertical file materials were never represented in the catalogue. Instead, access was provided through specialized indexes or locally maintained files. Other types of materials, while represented in the catalogue, received only cursory treatment, sometimes receiving no subject headings or receiving a classification number which did not reflect the intellectual content of the item but merely served as a shelving aid. *De facto*, over much of the Library's history, items added to the collection have received varying levels of cataloguing, ranging from none to detailed and comprehensive application of classification, subject headings, main and added entries, and bibliographic description. No consistent and unified approach has been followed, as practices have been determined by unit needs and requirements.

Standards have existed for some time for less-than-full levels of cataloguing. In 1978, AACR2 specified three levels of cataloguing, with use of any level determined by local requirements. In 1980, the publication of the *National Level Bibliographic Record - Books* provided a minimal-level cataloguing standard which was intended to be used for materials deemed less important by the cataloguing entity but which still warranted some degree of bibliographic control. The National Library of Canada had developed guidelines for which materials receive full and minimal cataloguing (see Appendix L) and effective April 1, 1996, has changed to three levels of cataloguing (full, minimal, abbreviated) from five (full, partial, enhanced minimal, minimal, abbreviated). The intent is to keep cataloguing as current as possible, ensuring access to materials, minimizing backlogs, and addressing the problem of reduced financial and human resources. The currency of an item is now a factor in determining the appropriate level of cataloguing (see Appendices O and P).

During the past few years, Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Task Groups have developed core-level standards for books, music materials, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Persian, Hebrew, and Yiddish materials, and work is currently underway on a standard for audiovisual materials. In addition, the CONSER Core Elements Task Force has recently developed a core bibliographic record standard for printed serials. The core-level record differs from the minimal-level record in that it requires full coding of USMARC fixed field values, a more complete set of descriptive elements, and requires a classification number that is recognized by USMARC. It has fewer access points than a full-level record, with flexible formulas for added entries and subject headings. Determinations about the latter can depend on local needs. These approaches have focused on reducing the overall number of data elements in a record, maintaining authority control on those access points that are given, and identifying the essential and required data elements which must be included. Further work is envisioned to simplify the standards that govern descriptive and subject cataloguing.

Technically speaking, all records imported from elsewhere and used locally are "derived" records. If a record is imported in a MARC communications format, regardless of its origin or quality, it is called a "MARC record". If one of these records originates at a national library, it is called a "source" record. If it originates elsewhere it is called a "non-source" record. Both "source" and "non-source" records have varying levels of fullness and quality. Some examples follow:

Source records

1. LC or NLC full level: - full description, access points in standardized form. Classification and standardized subject headings fully provided.
2. LC minimal level: - less than full description, a limited number of access points, but those provided are in standardized form. No classification is provided, a minimum or no subject headings, but those provided are in standardized form.
3. LC in process level: - an on-the-fly record keyed in quickly for purposes of prioritizing the cataloguing backlog. Title and sometimes author information, publisher information, and sometimes physical description. No classification, no subject headings, no standardized headings, frequent keying errors in data provided.
4. CIP record: - description provided before the item is published, based on information from the publisher or author. Title and series can change, as well as date of publication, when the item eventually appears. Access points are standardized as much as possible, given pre-publication information. Classification is provisional or partial, as are subject headings, and these are provided without the item in hand.
5. UKMARC record (from British Library): - description follows British cataloguing rules, and access points are not standardized to fit North American rules or files (there are frequent name conflicts between LC and UK name headings). Classification, where given, is partial or unreliable. The British Library doesn't classify according to LC, and hence has no vested interest in finding the most appropriate number. Similarly, subject headings, where given, are either unreliable or not formatted or applied according to North American rules.

Non-source records

Most bibliographic utilities (e.g. OCLC, ISM, RLIN) include source records as well as non-source records from a wide variety of contributing libraries - academic, public, and special. In addition to the types of fullness listed above for source records, non-source records may contain any combination of the following variations:

1. Description: - full, partial, brief, or in another language.
2. Name headings: - standardized, non-standard, or in another language.
3. Subject headings: - standardized, non-standard, in another language, or missing.
4. Classification: - LC schedules, local schedules, or missing.
5. Quality of data: - high, moderate, or unreliable.

In summary, records that can be accepted without modification are LC and NLC full-level records. Records that can be accepted with minimal modification are generally full-level records from North American, English language, academic libraries. Other source and non-source records require more work to correct or standardize the information in the fields that are designated as mandatory for the level of cataloguing assigned to a given item.

It is in this context that the LCTG has reviewed the Processing Implementation Group (PIG) proposal for three levels of cataloguing for materials added to the Library's collection, ranging from the creation of a brief record to full MARC cataloguing, whether source, derived or original (See Appendix N). The LCTG agrees with the PIG's proposal in principle, and therefore recommends:

*2. That the Library adopt three levels of cataloguing - **Level 3**, **Level 2**, and **Level 1** - for materials added to its collection.*

For each level, the key factor is the amount of editing performed on derived copy, or the extent of the original record creation. This is a more useful criterion to distinguish the three levels, than a simple differentiation between copy and original cataloguing. Data elements are generally not removed from derived records, i.e. all data elements from a derived record will be incorporated into the UBC record, but data elements may be added to augment Level 3 and Level 2 records where required. The level definitions as described below form general templates, and will form the basis for more specific ones designed for specialized materials, e.g. Fine Arts materials, music, or serials, which may require one or two additional data elements.

Level 3 - source/derived records are generally accepted without modification (see **Record Quality and Editing** below). Original record creation is restricted to a short set of data elements, e.g. “citation” level in PIG Discussion Paper #3. There is no local authority control work. This level of cataloguing is performed primarily by trained Library Assistants. Level 3 records can always be subsequently augmented by other staff. Data elements address requirements for basic item identification needed for ordering, basic online searching access, and the construction of record match keys for subsequent automated record upgrading. Other essential information for basic item identification, e.g. an uncontrolled numbered series statement, may also be necessary at this level. A Level 3 record would not include either controlled or uncontrolled subject headings. The following data elements must be included, if available and appropriate:

CAL	(call number)
HOL	(holdings: location, copy, and volume information, alternate call numbers)
LE \$E	(encoding level) If 0 or blank on an LC or NLC record, leave code ‘as is’. Otherwise assign it ‘z’, i.e. concept of encoding level does not apply.
LE \$T	(type of material)
LE \$B	(bibliographic level)
008 \$dt	(date type)
008 \$date1	
008 \$date2	
008 \$co	(country)
008 \$lan	(language)
010	(LC card number)
020	(ISBN)
lxx - or - 7xx	(one only; main or added entry; from first statement of responsibility)
245 a	(title proper) [NB. For In Process Records, b (subtitle) and c (statement of authorship) may be used as well as a]
250	(edition)
260	(imprint)
490 \$I1=0	(series statement, if required for ordering purposes)
856	(electronic location and access, e.g. URL, if relevant)

Level 2 - source/derived records are generally accepted without modification, although subsequent augmentation is possible (see **Record Quality and Editing** below). Original record creation may include additional data elements beyond those of the Level 3 record, e.g. “minimal” level in PIG Discussion Paper #3. There is minimal local authority control work (See **Authority**

Control below). This level of cataloguing is performed primarily by staff in branches and divisions, typically augmenting a Level 3 record created in a central processing unit by adding more access points, especially subject headings. The use of this level would be subject to guidelines that are clearly defined and consistently applied in all locations. It would not be desirable, for example, that a particular unit would elect to augment all its Level 3 records. The following data elements must be included, if available and appropriate:

CAL	(call number)
HOL	(holdings: location, copy, and volume information, alternate call numbers)
LE \$E	(encoding level) If 0 or blank on an LC or NLC record, leave code 'as is'. Otherwise assign it '5', i.e. partial/preliminary record.
LE \$T	(type of material)
LE \$B	(bibliographic level)
008 \$dt	(date type)
008 \$datel	
008 \$date2	
008 \$co	(country)
008 \$lan	(language)
010	(LC card number)
020	(ISBN)
lxx	(if relevant; main entry)
245	(full title, all subfields)
250	(edition)
260	(imprint)
300 a	(collation) excluding unnumbered leaves or plates.
490 \$I1=0 or 1	(series statement, if required for ordering purposes)
505	(include if present in source copy or use for specific categories of material, e.g. recordings, multi-volume sets)
440 or 8xx	(numbered series traced, as applicable)
6xx	(one subject heading, if relevant. The 6xx may be an uncontrolled subject heading, i.e. 653, rather than a controlled one. May augment to two, if required)
7xx	(one added entry, if relevant. May augment to two, if required)
856	(electronic location and access, e.g. URL, if relevant)

Level 1 - source/derived records are edited to conform with local requirements, although such requirements should be kept to a minimum. Original record creation is based on a national standard such as the core-level described above, or the "full" level described in PIG Discussion Paper #3. Such work is only performed by cataloguers and trained support staff. Creation/modification restrictions would apply for Level 1 records. Use of this level will be limited to clearly-defined subject areas and/or types of materials. The following data elements must be present if relevant:

CAL	(call number)
-----	---------------

HOL	(holdings: location, copy, and volume information, alternate call numbers)
LE \$E 0	(encoding level)
or blank	
LE \$T	(type of material)
LE \$B	(bibliographic level)
008 \$dt	(date type)
008 \$datel	
008 \$date2	
008 \$co	(country)
008 \$lan	(language)
010	(LC card number)
020	(ISBN)
1xx	(if relevant, main entry)
245	(full title, all subfields)
250	(edition)
260	(imprint)
300	(Physical description) [full a with local variations regarding other subfields]
490 \$II =0	(series statement)
or 1	
440 or 8xx	(Series) - [always accept LC's decision about tracing new series]
5xx	(all applicable notes)
6xx	(controlled subject headings as required)
7xx	(added entries as required)
856	(electronic location and access, e.g. URL, if relevant)

Record Creation and Maintenance

The use of these levels implies a distribution of bibliographic record creation and maintenance responsibilities to divisions and branches. The work will be performed by both cataloguing staff and appropriately trained public services staff. Maximum use will be made of existing cataloguing staff, both those in a central unit and those working in branches, who will have major responsibility for training and the maintenance of standards (see **Decentralization of Cataloguing** and **Training and Coordination** below). For this distribution to function effectively, completion of the conversion of the card catalogue into electronic form (recon) and the resulting creation of an electronic shelflist are essential. The LCTG recommends:

3. That appropriately trained staff throughout the Library, including a mix of both cataloguing and public services staff, be able to create, upgrade or augment bibliographic information in Level 3 and Level 2 records.

4. That record creation/maintenance standards for the three levels of cataloguing be developed, applied, and adhered to throughout the Library system.

5. That in order to support the distribution of bibliographic record creation and maintenance, the completion of recon and the resulting creation of an electronic shelflist be given a high priority.

Record Quality and Editing

The data elements proposed for Level 3 form the basic editing template for all higher levels. For such levels, the editing template is extended to include any data elements which are not part of the Level 3 basic editing template, but which are used as major or common access points (e.g. described or restricted in terms of name, title, and subject indexes, URL's) or fixed field limiting elements in the online catalogue. However, it should not be extended so widely as to require the editing of the whole record. The concept of an editing template is an important one when source/derived copy is used, and only data elements that are part of the editing template for a particular level should be checked. Checking for errors in data elements which do not form part of an editing template should be kept to an absolute minimum, even for Level 1 records. The LCTG recommends:

6. That error checking should be limited as much as possible to a visual comparison of editing template data elements in the record with data provided in the item being processed.

Record Augmentation and Upgrading

The searching for source/derived records and the creation of records will often occur in the central processing units, for reasons of economy of scale and efficiency, but it may also occur in many branches/divisions. Branches/divisions may elect to augment Level 3 records at a later date by an online search for source records, but only for those materials which fall within the guidelines for Level 2 cataloguing. The extensive current batch searching facilities for source records cannot be supported by vendor systems. As an alternative, the Library may use batch record search services provided by bibliographic utilities to periodically upgrade locally-created Level 3 and Level 2 records. The LCTG recommends:

7. That the Library use the services of bibliographic utilities to periodically upgrade locally-created Level 3 and Level 2 records to national standards.

Authority Control

Local authority control work is also a resource intensive practice that may become more difficult to maintain as bibliographic records are consolidated in a single file and record creation and maintenance is more widely distributed throughout the Library. A point to consider is that for public inquiry purposes, the main bibliographic file on UBCLIB has been consolidated from eight files of varying quality for almost four years. Half of the records in that two million-record file have not been subject to any form of authority control, and are not likely to be if the Library continues to rely on traditional approaches to local authority control work. The Library needs to confirm with bibliographic utilities which provide authority control services that it is possible to undertake partial or selective local authority control work and still use automated authority services.

If this can be done, limited local authority control may be desirable, depending on the level of cataloguing. At Level 3, there should be no local authority control. At Level 2, controlled subject headings should come from LCSH, CSH, or NLM. Uncontrolled headings, such as those for topical subjects, should be placed in fields designated for uncontrolled subject headings. These could be separately indexed, if this is desirable. The first time a title in a numbered series is received provides the opportunity to make a decision whether it is to be treated

as a set, a serial, classed as a monograph, or classed in a collected number. Recording this decision in an authority record and establishing the form of the series title facilitates the processing of future volumes in the series. The first time a work by or about a new literary author is received, a classification number must be assigned based on language and nationality of the author. Recording this number in an authority record facilitates the processing of future works by or about the author. At Level 1, subject headings should be assigned from LCSH, CSH, or NLM. There should be no local control of other subject headings. There would be local authority control for name and numbered series entries. The LCTG recommends:

8. That local authority control be limited to Level 2 and Level 1 records where appropriate, and that the Library make periodic use of the services of bibliographic utilities to provide derived authority data.

Cataloguing Workflow

It is a basic principle that materials acquired by the Library should be made available to users as quickly as possible. The Library should not accumulate backlogs. Searches for catalogue copy will be performed online at appropriate points in processing workflows: pre-order search, at time of order, or at time of receipt. If no copy is found at these points, a Level 3 record is created and processing is completed within established turn-around times, although materials which require Level 2 or Level 1 cataloguing would be forwarded to appropriately trained cataloguing staff for processing. All materials should receive final classification by appropriate levels of staff during their initial handling regardless of the level of bibliographic description. The basic principle should be that the physical item is processed quickly and only handled once while bibliographic information can be augmented or revised later by making use of records created by national or other authorities. Processing turn-around times will reinforce the intent to make items available to users as quickly as possible. These turn-around times will need to be determined, preferably by the staff directly involved in this work in consultation with public service units. For example, at least one academic library has established a standard of processing all items within 48 hours of receipt. The LCTG makes the following recommendations:

9. That there be no delay in processing materials in order to wait for the appearance of catalogue copy.

10. That appropriate processing turn-around times be developed, communicated, implemented, and evaluated by staff and management responsible for this activity.

Application of Levels of Cataloguing to Library Materials

The level of cataloguing which an item receives should relate to its perceived importance to users and how it will be used. Decisions about this are best made by reference librarians in the division/branch which holds the item, although there should be a consistent approach throughout the Library system. In general, most materials for which catalogue copy does not already exist would not receive more than Level 2 treatment. Materials which receive Level 1 cataloguing will be few, and should be research-level works which support UBC research and teaching. Examples include: (1) reference, as distinct from 'Library-use only' materials, (2) specialized materials, such as those relating to British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest, and (3) materials for which the Library has agreed to provide Level 1 cataloguing as part of a cooperative shared cataloguing agreement.

Materials which will soon be dated or which may be held for only a limited time should not receive Level 1 cataloguing. Serials should receive only Level 3 or 2 cataloguing. Access to extensive collections in electronic format, such as *IPO*, or to the contents of microform sets

should be provided in other ways than by locally cataloguing individual items contained within such collections.

To ensure speedy processing of materials, some items warranting Level 1 cataloguing may initially be classified and given Level 3 or 2 treatment if source copy is not available. The record would subsequently be upgraded, either when LC or other acceptable source copy becomes available, or through a periodic record upgrading process by a vendor. If no source copy becomes available after a fixed period of time, the record could be upgraded to Level 1 by original cataloguing. It remains to be determined whether the new DRA system will permit the tagging of records for review after a certain period of time. The LCTG recommends:

11. That most materials in the Library's collection initially receive no more than Level 2 cataloguing or catalogue copy checking, and that Level 1 cataloguing be reserved for reference and specialized materials such as those relating to British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest, or for materials for which the Library has agreed to provide Level 1 cataloguing as part of a cooperative shared cataloguing agreement.

Classification and Shelf Designation

The classification of materials is important as it provides a permanent location for materials in the Library's stacks and ensures that like materials are shelved together, facilitating browsing. While it is recognized that not all materials held by the Library warrant LC classification, the LCTG feels that the 'I' shelving designation, used as part of the Books-to-Branches program, should not become a permanent designation. These materials, if they are to be retained, should be classed appropriately and shelved into the stack collection. Newly-received materials should be classified promptly and shelved in the appropriate location, rather than backlogged in a processing area while awaiting derived copy. Alternative approaches to improve processing workflows and turnaround times are addressed below. The LCTG recommends:

12. That the 'I' shelving designation be discontinued, and that materials in this designation be reviewed for retention, and either discarded or classified appropriately.

Classification procedures should be simplified wherever possible. For materials given Level 1 treatment, the use of traditional LC classification tables and procedures will continue, although the recommendations of this report will increase the acceptability of classification numbers found on source/derived copy. It is estimated that for 50-60% of the items received which will warrant Level 3 or 2 cataloguing, MARC copy, including LC classification information, will be available. For these items, classification work will consist primarily of following well-defined cutting procedures, and can be performed by trained support staff. Another 20% of these items will fall into specific categories or subject areas where the use of LC classification tables and procedures is highly structured. The procedures already used for literary works could be extended to these areas, provided that: (a) guidelines and procedures are clearly identified, (2) suitable training is provided for support staff, (c) librarians are available to act as a resource, (d) staff performing this work maintain ongoing participation in a cataloguing liaison group. These percentages are only rough preliminary estimates, and will need further analysis and confirmation. The LCTG recommends:

13. That wherever possible, classification procedures for specific categories of materials be structured and codified, and that support staff be trained to perform such classification work.

As already mentioned, not all materials acquired by the Library will warrant classification. Ephemera, pamphlets, vertical file material, etc. form a category which is best

handled through local control within branches and divisions in terms of storage and arrangement. Such miscellaneous materials currently number more than 144,000 items (see Appendix Q for a detailed listing). A decision to classify or not classify such an item should be made by reference staff in the ordering location. The bibliographic record for such an item will form part of the online catalogue, and should provide information to the user as to where and how it is to be obtained. Wherever possible, local storage and arrangement should be such as to facilitate self-service. The LCTG recommends:

14. That bibliographic records for materials which do not warrant classification provide location and access information, and that the storage and arrangement of such materials in a manner to facilitate self-service be controlled by the branch or division where the material is located.

Integration of Record Creation and Ordering/Receipt Functions

The number of times an item is handled materially contributes to the length of time it takes to complete its processing. Duplicate or repetitive record creation at different stages of the processing workflow wastes staff time. Other libraries have looked closely at integrating receiving and basic bibliographic record creation functions, with acquisitions and other processing staff creating such records for items for which MARC copy is readily available. The LCTG recommends:

15. That the Head, Catalogue Division and the Head, Order Division, evaluate the implications of integrating certain bibliographic record creation functions with ordering/receipt procedures.

Decentralization of Cataloguing

New forms of electronic support for cataloguing staff which will provide online access to the various tools and references needed to perform Level 1 cataloguing, such as a Windows-based cataloguer's workstation and online versions of the LC schedules, should mean that cataloguers and cataloguing support staff are no longer bound by the need to be located near printed schedules and other aids. When recon is completed and an online shelflist is available, the new technology will lend itself to the distribution of cataloguing activities and the placement of staff in decentralized locations, where they can work closely with those librarians and staff responsible for collection development and public services. Such a working relationship should have a synergistic effect on the services provided by a specific subject division or branch. Volume of work is a consideration - not every location would be suitable for the placement of cataloguing staff - and a central core of librarians and support staff will continue to provide cataloguing services for a variety of smaller units. Any relocation of cataloguing staff will require the provision of adequate staff space and working facilities in public services branches and divisions. The LCTG recommends:

16. That where warranted by the volume of work, cataloguers and cataloguing support staff work in branches or divisions for which they provide specialized cataloguing services in terms of subject, language, or material format, and that the Library provide them with the necessary space and facilities to carry out their responsibilities..

Training and Coordination

Training, coordination, and maintenance of system-wide standards in a decentralized cataloguing environment will require new organizational responses. Cataloguing staff will still need to meet regularly to review and discuss changes in standards, workflow, and other cataloguing-related issues. Ongoing operational support for training, documentation, and guiding cataloguing issues through other appropriate organizational components (Library Administration,

Public Service Heads, Collections Management Council, Public Catalogues Task Group, etc.) will still require an operational "home." Such a forum will also provide a mechanism to exchange information and ensure that cataloguing activities are coordinated. For example, it will be necessary to monitor and periodically adjust field specifications for the levels of cataloguing in response to changing requirements, and the criteria for assigning materials to the most suitable cataloguing level will often require review and adjustment with discussion and decision making occurring at a library-wide level. To ensure that these responsibilities are carried out in an effective manner, some group or unit must be assigned those functions. The LCTG therefore recommends:

17. That a Cataloguing Liaison Group be established to address, resolve, and communicate cataloguing standards, procedures, and other cataloguing-related issues for the Library system.

18. That a Cataloguing Unit be assigned operational responsibility for system-wide training, documentation, conformance to standards, and overall coordination.

Sources of Bibliographic Information and Cooperative Cataloguing

The Library has used source records from national authorities, bibliographic utilities, consortia, and other institutions both in print and in electronic format. The use of such information to catalogue newly received materials has continued to grow over the past thirty years. Derivative cataloguing now accounts for some 94% of materials catalogued, although some 50% of derivative copy presently requires some form of professional intervention in terms of the provision of call numbers or subject headings to be useful. At the same time, the Library has contributed its own original records for the use of others. Cooperative cataloguing ventures are only viable when all participants contribute original records. As a major research library, the UBC Library cannot solely depend on others to provide source/derived records without contributing itself, especially in relation to unique local resources, and this implies the availability of trained cataloguers and cataloguing staff. For example, the Library makes effective use of specialized staff for creating and contributing original records for CJK materials in partnership with other libraries. The LCTG recommends:

19. That the Library continue to create and contribute original records for unique local resources which support teaching and research priorities at the University, and for materials in areas where it has cataloguing staff with specialized subject and language skills as part of cooperative cataloguing arrangements.

Book vendors, specialized vendors, and bibliographic utilities are now able to provide various forms of enhanced source/derived records and shelf-ready materials to their customers, and some academic libraries have made use of these services for a considerable part of their cataloguing and processing workload. In so doing, they claim to have eliminated backlogs, and greatly decreased the time between receipt of an item and making it available to the user catalogued and ready for use. It is difficult to determine the cost-effectiveness of such services in the absence of reliable information about the Library's own cataloguing productivity and production costs and the effect of locally-initiated changes in work procedures. Dependable figures are notoriously absent from the cataloguing literature, and reported costs for both original and derived cataloguing vary widely. The LCTG therefore recommends:

20. That the AUL for Technical Services and the Head, Catalogue Division, determine productivity and cost statistics for cataloguing and related processing activities in order to

evaluate the effectiveness of locally-initiated changes in work procedures and to compare the Library's cost-effectiveness to that of vendor-provided services.

The LCTG does not see vendor-provided cataloguing services as a panacea. Collective agreements limit the Library's ability to contract out processing work. Specialized requirements and treatment of material, additional data elements needed for local practices, and the number of items requiring original cataloguing may substantially increase quoted costs. Moreover, a library which places its cataloguing operations in the hands of a vendor and which loses its own skilled cataloguing staff has taken a course which is difficult to reverse. While current pricing may be attractive, once vendors have a captive market, there is nothing to prevent substantial price increases.

Exceptions and Local Practices

Because of a wide variety of exceptions and local practices, much source/derived copy must be reviewed, checked, and modified before being used to create a record for the Library's catalogue. Besides creating additional work for cataloguing staff, exceptions and local practices make UBC Library records less useful as shared copy to the national and international library community, and thus hinder cooperative cataloguing efforts. Appendices J and K list the changes which are currently made to classifications and to MARC records to suit UBC requirements. The reasons for variances from LC are many - LC has introduced new schedules and UBC continues to follow previous practice; UBC tries to reclassify older materials it acquires into the new schedule to group like materials together; LC did not have a classification schedule for the subject area, and UBC used an alternate; the LC classification did not make adequate provision for Canadian literature or history; a desire to force materials into particular class numbers to ensure that they are shelved in a specific branch; new geographical or political changes which have led to revisions of the schedules; a desire to class bibliographies with their subjects, etc. etc.

The exceptions and local practices were described in detail in a 1989 report by Ann Turner attached as Appendix I. A further report by Bill Watson, which focused on Canadian and childrens' literature is attached as Appendix H. Little progress has been made in eliminating many of these anomalies, as some are seen as contributing to improved access for users, while for others, it is always easier to change one item at a time as it is received, than to revise a large number of previously-catalogued materials. Yet it is clear that the future cost of not abandoning such changes only continues to grow.

Except for nationally-recognized alternate schedules such as those for medicine, Canadian literature, and Canadian history, the LCTG feels that it is now time to eliminate or plan for the elimination of as many of these variances as possible and to follow current LC/NLC/NLM practice. It recognizes that in some instances there will be shelving conflicts, and that material related to one topic may be shelved in different locations. However, the collection is already fragmented among branch libraries and numerous storage locations - today the concept of a linear classified shelving arrangement which facilitates browsing is indeed a myth. Over time, separate shelving runs will be resolved through reclassification initiatives, through the relegation of older materials to storage, or through the discard of older materials. The LCTG therefore makes the following recommendation:

21. That aside from the exceptions listed below, the Library follow current LC/NLC/NLM practice for classification and cataloguing, adopting the principle of accepting catalogue copy as is wherever possible, with verification only of the data elements appropriate to the level of cataloguing assigned to the item being processed.

Canadian Literature

The Library currently classifies works by or about new Canadian literary authors, whether writing in English or French, and general criticisms or collections of Canadian literature in PS 8000-8599, a classification range established and used by NLC and recognized by LC. Special treatment of Canadian literature and authors suits the teaching and research needs of faculty and students at a Canadian academic institution, and in general the numbers for literary authors can be established or adjusted by trained library assistants.

A local scheme, PR8900-9349, was used for Canadian authors and literature until the NLC classification range was adopted. Established classification numbers for earlier authors have not been changed, and catalogue copy for newly acquired works by or about them is modified to use the established numbers. It would be desirable to reclass the works of and about earlier authors to shelve in the PS8000-8599 range, but the LCTG recognizes that attempting to do this on an encounter basis is not effective. The LCTG recommends:

22. That the Library continue the practice of NLC in using the PS8000-8500 range for new Canadian literary authors, and plan for the reclassification of established numbers for earlier authors as a one-time project.

Commonwealth English-language Literature

English language literature outside of England is classed by LC in PR8500-9899. This practice is followed by NLC. The Library has established its own range of numbers which avoids conflicts with the earlier Canadian literature expansion. Until all Canadian literature is reclassified into the PS8500-8599 range, adoption of LC practice would cause number conflicts, and impair the browsability of Commonwealth English-language literary authors. Neither LC nor NLC collect extensively in this area, and much source/derived copy comes either without LC classification or with some local variant, requiring establishment of author numbers. Classification decisions for these literary works can be made by trained library assistants. Continued use of the UBC expansion is appropriate until such time as Canadian literature is reclassified. At that point, the UBC Library expansion could cease to be used, and LC practice followed. The LCTG recommends:

23. That the Library continue its current use of a local expansion for classifying the works of Commonwealth English-language authors other than Canadian until all Canadian authors are reclassified into PS8000-8500.

Children's Literature

Most children's or juvenile literature classification numbers are changed to conform to UBC Library practices which provide more detailed arrangements for such categories as picture books, fairy tales, and folk tales. Most of these groupings could be accomplished more effectively through the use of sublocations or local shelving arrangements, and bibliographic access could be provided through uncontrolled subject headings. Reference staff in the Education Library have persuaded the LCTG that an exception should be made for English language picture books of less than 32 pages, as this specific category of material is heavily used by students and teachers. As the page limit makes it easy to categorize such material, the continued use of the PZ 4.9 classification is appropriate. For the remainder of children's literature, current UBC practice should cease, and LC practice followed for all newly-acquired material. The LCTG therefore recommends:

24. That with the exception of English language picture books of less than 32 pages, the Library abandon its in-house classification for children's and juvenile literature and follow the current practice of LC for all newly-acquired material.

Law

The Library adopted the Moys classification for law materials in the absence of an LC K schedule. The subsequent development of a K classification for law calls into question the continued use of Moys, as the latter is not being developed or expanded. Moreover, relatively few libraries use Moys, and little source copy with Moys numbers is available. Thus most newly-acquired materials require the assignment of a classification number by a librarian. On the other hand, the LC K schedule is still undergoing development, and many local and Canadian materials are not acquired by LC and thus do not receive LC classifications. Unfortunately, both schemes use the same range of numbers in different ways, so that interfiling materials classified in the two systems would be impracticable and seriously inconvenience users. In the long term, the Moys classification system will become increasingly dated, and the LC K classification will stabilize, making a change to LC practice desirable. In view of the needs of the users, however, such a change should be implemented concurrently with a one-time reclassification project for the materials classified in Moys. Special funding for such a project should be sought from the legal community. The LCTG therefore recommends:

25. That the Library continue the use of the Moys classification for law, not changing to the LC K schedule until funding is available to permit the completion of a one-time reclassification project.

Photography as Art

LC classifies photography as art in TR along with the technical aspects of photography. The Fine Arts Library has preferred to have such materials classed in a locally-maintained NH classification, treating artistic photography in the same manner as painting, sculpture, and other fine arts. Classification in NH has ensured the material is shelved in the Fine Arts Library as well. The NH section now contains some 2,000 items. The LCTG feels that changes in classification to ensure shelving in a particular location are unwarranted, and that TR provides adequate treatment for such materials. Additional access points, if needed, could be provided by uncontrolled subject headings or notes. In view of the limited number of items, some priority should be given to reclassifying the NH collection to intershelve it with the remainder of the materials on photography. The LCTG therefore recommends:

26. That the Library cease classifying materials on photography as art in NH, follow LC practice in classifying them in TR, and give some priority to reclassifying the NH collection.

Canadian History

The Library follows NLC practice in classifying materials on Canadian history in FC 1-4200, an expansion recognized by LC, rather than using LC's F1001-F1140 range. In addition, materials on the War of 1812 are classed with Canadian history in FC442-449 rather than with American history in E351-364.9. These adjustments meet the needs of students and researchers at a Canadian institution. Materials classed in UBC's earlier Canadian history schedule, F5000-6099 are slowly being reclassified to the new FC range on an encounter basis. The LCTG feels that it would be more effective to accomplish this as a one-time reclassification project once RECON is completed. The LCTG recommends:

27. *That the Library continue to follow NLC practice in classifying materials on Canadian history in FC, and plan a one-time project to reclassify remaining items in the old Canadian history range once RECON is completed.*

Medicine

The Library uses NLM's W classification for human anatomy, physiology, microbiology and medicine rather than LC's QM, QP, QR, and R classifications. In addition, the cataloguing staff add NLM subject headings for medical material if these are not present in source copy. These practices meet the specialized needs of students and researchers in the Faculty of Medicine and in the related health sciences. The LCTG recommends:

28. *That the Library continue to follow NLM practice in classifying medical and related materials.*

29. *That the Library continue the use of NLM subject headings for medical materials.*

Bibliographies

LC normally provides two classification numbers for bibliographies, one in Z and one in the appropriate classification schedule for the subject. The UBC Library has been prefixing the latter number with a Z but shelving the material within the range for the subject. A number of reference units have indicated that the topical classification number by itself is adequate, and that the Z prefix is not required. The LCTG recommends:

30. *That the Library abandon the use of compound Z numbers for bibliographies and use the LC topical classification numbers.*

Microforms

There is general agreement that this material does not lend itself to browsing, and that it should be organized in a manner to facilitate retrieval and reshelving. The locally-developed AW classification fulfills this function. The LCTG recommends:

31. *That the Library continue with the use of the AW classification for microforms as a shelving tool.*

Colbeck Collection

It does not appear that material is being added to this collection. If further purchases are made, materials should be classified according to normal UBC practice. The LCTG recommends:

32. *That the Library abandon the special classification for the Colbeck Collection, and follow current UBC practice for literary authors added to the Collection. The classification of earlier materials would not be changed.*

Non-standard Author Numbers

For certain British, American and European authors, the UBC Library uses a classification number which varies from that used by LC. In most cases this is the result of UBC acquiring materials before they were acquired by LC, or where LC has made a subsequent change

in the classification number. The Library currently does not change such numbers for English-language authors, but adopts the LC number for European authors, provided the Library holds five or fewer works by that author. This minimizes the amount of reclassification which takes place. The LCTG recommends:

33. That the Library continue with its current practice in maintaining already established non-standard numbers for English-language authors but changing to LC's number for European authors when the Library holds five works or less by the author concerned.

New Editions

The Library has attempted to keep later editions together with earlier ones even when the later ones have been given another classification number by LC. The rationale has been that this makes it easier for the user to find the latest edition of a particular item. Yet later editions may incorporate additional material which warrants a different classification number. Moreover, the relegation to storage of earlier editions reduces the usefulness of this practice. Reclassification to keep editions together has already been abandoned for science materials, and it seems appropriate to cease doing so for materials in other disciplines. The LCTG is aware of the concerns expressed about abandoning the practice for editions of the works of literary authors, but feels that the more specialized treatment of literary authors will address some of these. If a major problem arises in the case of this category, the recommendation can be reviewed. The LCTG therefore recommends:

34. That the Library abandon the practice of changing classification numbers to keep editions together.

Monographs in Series

As mentioned above, local authority control of series entries should be limited to numbered series. Volumes in unnumbered series should be classed as monographs. For new numbered series, if LC or another national authority has made a decision to class the series as a collection or as monographs, that decision should be followed. If LC gives a choice, or there is no source copy, the decision will be made by reference staff in the appropriate division or branch. The LCTG recommends:

35. That the Library follow the practice of LC in classifying monographs in numbered series as monographs or as a collection.

Music Scores and Sound Recordings

The Library uses the MARC format for cataloguing music scores, which are classified in LC's M classification. Source records include uniform titles, both in main and added entries, LC subject headings, and a suggested M classification number. The variety of languages in which titles of musical works appear and the non-specificity of many score titles make the use of uniform titles a necessity if users are to obtain easy access to particular works by individual composers. In addition, Library staff make use of uniform titles for music materials when providing reference service, in pre-order searching, in interlibrary loan verification, and in cataloguing. Abandoning the use of uniform titles for music materials would make it more difficult for staff to their work accurately and efficiently. Moreover, not using uniform titles would make the Library's music cataloguing less valuable as shared copy. As the use of uniform

titles for music materials is supported by national authorities, and is useful both to users and staff, the LCTG recommends:

36. That the Library continue to use uniform titles for cataloguing music materials.

The Library uses neither the M classification or the MARC format for cataloguing sound recordings. In fact, two slightly different local systems are used to classify sound recordings, one for the Music Library and another for the Wilson Recordings Collection. Few libraries, including national authorities, classify sound recordings in M, and as in the case of microform materials, a locally-developed arrangement can meet the needs of both users and staff. However, it seems redundant to maintain two local variants, and a modified version of the Music Library's system, using first-cut title cutters rather than uniform title cutters seems most practical and permits the work to be done by support staff. The LCTG therefore recommends:

37. That the Library abandon the in-house classification scheme for the Wilson Recordings Collection and use a modified version of the Music Library's classification system for sound recordings throughout the Library.

Sound recordings are listed in a non-standard format in the local Recordings File. The information provided ranges from minimal to extensive analysis of individual cuts. As already mentioned, the MARC format is not currently used. Yet source/derived copy in MARC format for sound recordings is available, and it would make sense to use this, as it provides more access points - uniform titles for main entries and added entries, LC subject headings, contents notes - and thus more information for users. In addition, the use of the MARC format would make UBC's records for sound recordings more useful as shared copy. The LCTG recommends:

38. That the Library adopt the use of the MARC format for cataloguing sound recordings.

Sound recordings may include multiple works by a single composer or works by numerous different composers. The effort involved in analyzing individual cuts on a recording can be extensive. Even LC limits the number of added entries for works by a single composer to five, and for works by different composers to 25. As the Library does not provide extensive analytics for print or microform materials, there appears little reason to do so for sound recordings. The classification should be determined by the composer of the first cut. The number of added entries, whether composers or uniform titles, and subject headings should relate to the level of cataloguing assigned to the item, with additional information being provided in the form of contents notes. Keyword searching of such contents notes can provide additional access to the individual cuts of the recording. Naturally, if source/derived copy includes additional headings, these will not be discarded, and as for other materials, periodic upgrading of Level 3 and 2 UBC records to national standards could be provided by a vendor. The LCTG recommends:

39. That the classification of a sound recording be determined by the composer of the first cut, and that the number of added entries and subject headings be governed by the level of cataloguing assigned to the recording.

The LCTG is aware that there exists a substantial backlog of uncatalogued sound recordings. While some attempt has been made to brieflist these, the majority remain unprocessed and unavailable for use. These recordings should be made available for use quickly, making use of MARC records or OCLC copy where possible. Where no derivative copy exists, the recordings should initially be catalogued at Level 3. The LCTG recommends:

40. That the backlog of uncatalogued sound recordings be promptly processed, making full use of derivative copy where available and otherwise catalogued at Level 3.

Uniform Titles

Uniform titles are a resource-intensive practice and essentially a very specialized type of authority control. Their use at UBC has been reviewed in the past, especially as they are not applied in a comprehensive manner. For example, the Library does not use all uniform titles supported by national authorities, and some, like the 'works, selections, correspondence' ones for personal authors seem of little use. The LCTG feels that the use of uniform titles should be minimized, especially in the Library's own original cataloguing. Yet for certain categories of material (music as noted above, sacred and anonymous classics) and for a few authors, the use of uniform titles facilitates access for users. Except where supported by national authorities, and where clearly of benefit to users as decided by reference staff, alternate access options such as increased use of subject headings and/or keyword access to notes information should replace uniform titles. In keeping with the principle of accepting source/derivative copy 'as is' wherever possible, however, and as recommended by reference staff, uniform titles provided in such copy will not be deleted. The LCTG recommends:

41. That except where supported by national authorities and clearly facilitating access for users, the Library cease the use of uniform titles, replacing this use with additional subject headings or keyword access to notes, although uniform titles provided in source/derivative copy will not be deleted.

Theses

Theses written at UBC, particularly those with local or Canadian content, are a significant UBC contribution to the scholarly literature. Bibliographic access, especially to those at the Master's level, is limited. Master's theses are no longer sent to the National Library for filming and are no longer included in *Dissertation Abstracts*. Moreover, subject analysis in *Dissertation Abstracts* is poor. The Library should ensure that UBC's contribution to scholarship is catalogued and made accessible, and that these records are shared with other institutions. The final report of the Subject Analysis for UBC Theses Subcommittee of the Catalogue Operations Liaison Group (see Appendix F) reviewed the cataloguing of theses, and noted that different approaches could be used for theses in the sciences and for those in the humanities/social sciences. While in the former keyword access to title words provides satisfactory retrieval, in the latter keyword searching is generally not as successful, and the use of subject headings was strongly recommended by reference librarians in non-science units.

Historically, all UBC theses were classed together in LE3 B7 subdivided by year, faculty and department. However, print copies of theses are no longer kept, and access is only provided to microform copies. Users often request access to theses by faculty or year. To facilitate such access, the use of unnumbered controlled series headings should be continued. These can be applied by trained library assistants. The LCTG recommends:

42. That access to UBC theses be provided through the use of unnumbered controlled series headings which group theses by year, faculty, and department.

The Subcommittee's report recommended different treatment for doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and original creative works. The LCTG supports this approach and recommends:

43. That all UBC doctoral dissertations receive at least Level 2 cataloguing, except that those in the sciences and those which are original creative works in the humanities and social sciences do not require subject headings.

44. That all UBC dissertations and master's theses in subjects outside the sciences receive at least Level 2 cataloguing if the topic is Canadian or written in a foreign language, or if they have non-descriptive titles.

Maps

At present, maps are classified by the map librarian and a reference librarian in Special Collections. MARC format is being used, but most maps are listed in a separate maps file. With the coming integration of various files into one bibliographic file, the objective should be to integrate the procedures for the classification and cataloguing of maps with those used for other materials. The LCTG recommends:

45. That the Head, Special Collections/Fine Arts/University Archives/Map Library and the Head, Catalogue Division, review the procedures for cataloguing maps in order to integrate them with those used for other materials.

Error Correction

The Library presents a number of public faces to its users which determine how these users view the Library, its mission, and its staff. Errors and mistakes, whether within bibliographic records in the online catalogue or in the marking of materials, create a perception of carelessness and inaccuracy. The objective should be a high standard of accuracy in the processing of materials and in the creation of bibliographic records. Current procedures make it time-consuming, cumbersome, and expensive to correct errors, especially where materials must be retrieved and sent to LPC for remarking. Rather than not correcting errors because current procedures do not work, the LCTG believes that current procedures should be changed and simplified. Trained staff in branches and divisions should be able to correct online bibliographic records and should have the necessary equipment to relabel materials, removing the necessity to return materials to LPC. Where required, division/branch staff should consult with a cataloguer or cataloguing staff, and in some cases, the latter will make the correction to the online record. Where appropriate, users should be given prompt feedback about the correction of errors which they have reported. Such a practice will ensure that the Library continues to be seen as a user-focused organization. The LCTG recommends:

46. That most errors, whether in bibliographic records or in the labelling of materials, be corrected promptly by trained divisional/branch staff, and that users reporting such errors are appropriately thanked.

Implementation

These recommendations, if implemented, have the possibility of substantially changing the working routines of cataloguers and cataloguing staff at the UBC Library. The adoption of a three-tiered approach to cataloguing, the greater acceptance of catalogue copy as is, and the elimination of many anomalous and labor-intensive practices will free up the time of both librarians and support staff, and contribute to a faster turn-around time for materials in process, greater throughput, and reduced backlogs. Suggested organizational changes will provide cataloguing staff with new opportunities for collegial working relationships with public services staff and the Library's users.

The recommendations of this report should be discussed and reviewed by the Library Administration, Division and Branch Heads, and staff in both technical services and public services units, with closure being reached on the recommendations by the end of September 1996. Implementation should be integrated with the planning and implementation of the new DRA

system, and take place during the period October 1, 1996 to May 1, 1997. The LCTG therefore recommends:

47. That the University Librarian appoint a project team with the mandate to complete the implementation of the recommendations of this report by May 1, 1997.

Prepared by: Erik de Bruijn

References

- Cargill, Karen. "The Upside of Downsizing." *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 19:1 (1995) 53-57.
- Cromwell, Willy. "The Core Record: A New Bibliographic Standard." *LRTS* 38:4 (1994) 415-424.
- Gorman, Michael. "The Corruption of Cataloging." *Library Journal* (September 15, 1995) 32-34.
- Holt, Glen. "Cataloging Outsourcing: No Clear-cut Choice." *Library Journal* (September 15, 1995) 34.
- Ruschoff, Carlen. "Perspectives on the Cataloging Literature - Cataloging's Prospects: Responding to Austerity with Innovation." *JAL* 21:1 (1995) 51-57.
- Waite, Ellen J. "Reinvent Catalogers!" *Library Journal* (November 1995) 36-37.

List of Appendices

Appendix A

Notes from Site Visits

Appendix B

Report of the Work Group on Processing and Cataloging Priorities. University of Chicago Library, October 1994.

Appendix C

Cataloging Simplification Task Force Report. Brown University Library, October 1993.

Appendix D

National -Level Record and Minimal-Level Record Requirements. USMARC Bibliographic Appendix A, March 1994.

Appendix E

Report of the Accompanying Materials Task Group. UBC Library, November 1994.

Appendix F

Report of the Catalogue Operations Liaison Group Subject Analysis for UBC Theses Subcommittee. UBC Library, May 1994.

Appendix G

Kelley, Sherry, and Brian Schottlaender. *UCLA/OCLC Core Record Pilot Project: Preliminary Report.* UCLA, June 1995.

Appendix H

Watson, Bill. *Classification: Canadian Literature & Children's Literature.* UBC Library, May 1991.

Appendix I

Turner, Ann. *Modification of Classifications on Catalogue Copy*. UBC Library, November 1989.

Appendix J

Gordon, Leah. *Classifications to be changed &/or which determine locations*. UBC Library, August 1995.

Appendix K

Changes/Additions to MARC Records, a Field-by-Field Analysis: LA 3's & 4's. UBC Library, undated.

Appendix L

Levels of Cataloguing for Materials Catalogued by the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch, National Library of Canada. NLC, May 1991.

Appendix M

From Order to Patron Task Group. *FOTP DP7: Cataloguing Work and Workflow; Recommendations 17 and 19*. UBC Library, undated.

Appendix N

Processing Implementation Group. *P.I.G. Discussion Paper #3: Levels of Cataloguing and Category Groups*. UBC Library, August 1993.

Appendix O

National Library of Canada. *Revised Levels of Cataloguing Treatment Applied by the National Library of Canada*. April 1996.

Appendix P

National Library of Canada. *Revised Levels of Cataloguing Treatment Applied by the National Library of Canada. Annex A: Categories of Material and Their Levels of Cataloguing Treatment*. April 1996.

Appendix Q

UBC Library. *Miscellaneous Collection Count*. March 1996.

Appendix R

B.C. Cataloguing Standard for Videorecordings. April 1996.

Appendix S

UBC Library. *Recommended Revised List of Classifications to Be Changed*. May 1996.