



**Art Libraries Society of North America, 34th Annual Conference
Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel, Banff, Alberta, Canada, May 5-9, 2006**

**Cataloging Problems Discussion Group
Sunday, May 7, 2006, 4:40 - 6:00 p.m.**

Moderator: Sherman Clarke, New York University

Recorder: Elizabeth Lilker, New York University

Attendees:

Heidi Hass, Morgan Library & Museum;
Margaret Ford, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston;
Daniel Starr, Metropolitan Museum of Art;
Elizabeth Lilker, New York University;
Meg Black, Metropolitan Museum of Art;
Mary Jane Cuneo, Harvard University;
Kay Teel, Stanford University;
Nancy Norris, UCLA;
Sarah Quimby, Minneapolis Institute of Arts;
Angela Sidman, Clark Art Institute;
Valerie Krall, Clark Art Institute;
Sonja Staum, IUPUI Herron Art Library;
Leigh Gates, Art Institute of Chicago;
Lynda Bunting, Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles;
Rodica Tanjala Krauss, Frick Art Reference Library;
Laurie Glover, Clark Art Institute;
Penny Baker, Clark Art Institute;
Linda McRae, University of South Florida;
Melanie Seal, Cleveland Museum of Art;
Pauline Wolstencroft, LACMA;
Roger Lawson, National Gallery of Art;
Ida Z. daRoza, Academy of Art University;
Liz O'Keefe, Morgan Library & Museum;
Isabella Marqués De Castilla, Library of Congress;
Christina Peter, Frick Art Reference Library;
Zimra Panitz, School of Visual Arts;
Ellie Nacheman, RISD;
Julie Mellby, Princeton University;
James Findlay, Bienes Center, Broward County Library;
Maria Oldal, Morgan Library & Museum;
Joan Benedetti.

Minutes:

Sherman Clarke welcomed the attendees. He said it was unfortunate that the meeting was at the same time as another of interest, the Artist Files Working Group meeting. This group is looking for established "best practices" guidelines for museum collections.

Sherman began by saying there were two big issues recently effecting catalogers. First, the news of the RLG and OCLC merger is of concern to many catalogers who rely on their bibliographic record in RLIN21. It is not certain what a combined database will include. Second, the notice from the Library of Congress, dated April 20, 2006, announced their decision to cease to provide controlled series access in the bibliographic records beginning May 1, 2006. This decision, and the manner in which it was announced, was the cause of much concern and grief to the cataloging community. Many librarians cannot remember any LC decision being implemented on such short notice. Due to the reaction, implementation has been postponed until June 1, 2006. As many libraries depend on LC's series authority work, it is uncertain if the collective PCC libraries will be able to replace LC in producing series authority records. Isabella Marqués de Castilla (Library of Congress) said that questions or concerns about the series decision should be directed to CPSO in order to obtain authoritative information. She said that through the Library of Congress website the CPSO webpage (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso>) information can be accessed. She said that in January of this year the cataloging division lost a significant number of catalogers due to retirement.

Kay Teel (Stanford University) said that PCC libraries may have to follow LC's practices. She said this decision would complicate classed-together series at Stanford. Daniel Starr (Metropolitan Museum of Art) said that some series could be abandoned, while others were very important. Mary Jane Cuneo (Harvard University) said some senior catalogers at her institution feel that PCC should not take up the work LC is dropping, because in most institutions management will not support it. It was also mentioned that the Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) could write a letter protesting LC's decision.

Daniel Starr talked about the problems with LCSH period subdivisions for East Asia. Many of the dynasties are combined, and do not reflect current scholarship. He suggested starting a small task force to draft a letter the CAC could send to CPSO.

After discussing these issues, Sherman asked that anyone in the room could bring up a topic for discussion. Margaret Ford (Museum of Fine Arts, Houston) asked if anyone could recommend training material for new catalogers. Heidi Hass (Morgan Library & Museum) recommended Cataloging Concepts manuals published by LC. Sherman added that the New York Catalogers Discussion Group (CDG) had a meeting last December that discussed local documentation, and that the minutes are available on the CDG website (<http://www.artcataloging.net/cdg/cdgcover.html>)

Daniel Starr questioned the lack of documentation on cataloging back-to-back publications. Rodica Tanjala Krauss (Frick Art Reference Library) suggested he look at the SCIPPIO guidelines for auction catalogs.

Lynda Bunting (MOCA) asked how others were keeping current with the work generated by catalogers adding death dates to name authority records. Sherman mentioned that OCLC had an RSS feed on their website, and changed headings were posted weekly. Sherman also mentioned that NYU would soon have their catalog sent for processing to LTI. Heidi Hass said she had a library assistant doing this work that pertained to the Morgan's catalog. Sherman reminded attendees that cleaning up related name/title records should be revised when the name record is revised.

Kay Teel spoke about the new CONSER access level pilot project. This shorter bibliographic record for serials will affect copy cataloging for serials, as CONSER will be adopting this record standard. Information on this is available at the CONSER website (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/access-level.html>)

She has also been a participant in the new SACO Participants' manual, which will be finished soon. She said it includes a few more examples of named buildings and art subject heading proposals.

Rodica talked about the desire of maintaining cataloging skills by some sort of training on a more regular basis than the workshops at ALA or ARLIS/NA. She said she was aware that cataloging by example was not the best practice, but was often how she worked. When she asked for a show of hands asking how many of the attendees felt stressed by the amount of cataloging, most of attendees raised their hands. Daniel suggested that cataloging questions could be posed to ARLIS-L; it would benefit us all, and that AUTOCAT was too diverse. Isabella suggested that while she received thorough training at LC, she always marked particular rules she consulted in AACR2 and other documentation.

Ida daRoza asked how often an institution should have their authority file cleaned? Answers ranged from as often as you can afford it to annually.