Modifying the Representation Structure on the PCC Policy Committee
November 2016

Since its inception, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Committee (PoCo) has had a structure whereby PCC institutions elect rotating representatives according to the following distribution:

- three representatives from institutions that are full-level participants in BIBCO;

- two representatives from institutions that are full-level participants in NACO;

- two representatives from institutions that are full-level participants in SACO;

- three representatives from institutions that are either full- or associate-level participants in CONSER.

To provide continuity over time, these PoCo positions rotate, with members serving staggered three-year terms. Members may serve multiple terms, but no more than two consecutive terms.

This structure has served the PCC well over the last twenty years. The structure initially helped support and grow the individual programs, and over time provided the overall community with assurance that the Policy Committee had balanced representation for each of the four programs. With these four programs now well established, with a dedicated PCC Secretariat providing much of the day-to-day operations for the Program, and with three PCC Standing Committees (Standards, Training, and Automation) providing the practitioner communities with opportunities to directly impact and guide the evolution of our metadata standards and their application and the continuing education and professional development of catalogers all over the world, it makes sense to reconsider that structure.

The PCC's current Strategic Directions "are intended to focus specifically on how the PCC will invest in continuing education, experimentation, and other activities that will extend our collective understanding of emerging technologies, deepen the expertise of the community, and enable informed decision making." While the current rotating membership model reflects our valuable PCC programs, it also reflects a metadata production model that is record-based. As we look toward linked data futures that are statement-based, rather than solely record-based, the PCC's own models for accounting for PCC production will also need to evolve.

The Steering and Policy Committees have been charged in Strategic Direction 4.1 to "Assess the impact of the strategic directions on the PCC's membership and governance structures." As a part of this process, Steering has been assessing the effectiveness of the elected PoCo positions as it relates to (1) the operational dynamic of PoCo, and (2) how new and emerging data management structures might impact the structure, governance, and leadership needs of the Program.

Operational dynamic: Even though the positions on PoCo are staggered, there are frequently years when each of the four programs has a vacancy. To avoid single-candidate ballots, the Nominations Committee always strives to have a minimum of two candidates on the ballot for each vacancy. In some years, this requires the Nominations Committee to identify a minimum of 8 final candidates who have agreed to run for office. For the NACO and BIBCO programs, this has been relatively manageable. However, the CONSER and SACO programs simply have fewer actively-contributing member institutions from which to draw potential candidates from year to year. As a result, we have

experienced several cycles over the last 5-6 years that were incredibly challenging for the Nominations Committee to manage; these trends must be addressed. A further issue we have faced is that while candidates may come from a CONSER institution, for instance, does not mean they are experienced with serials cataloging, and have therefore been reluctant to run under programs to which they have not personally contributed themselves.

Also to the point on PoCo's operational dynamic, experience has consistently shown that once an individual has been elected to PoCo, they effectively represent the entire PCC, regardless of which program they were initially elected to represent. This working dynamic can be attributed to a number of factors:

- the very nature of PoCo's purpose and agenda is high-level and PCC-wide;

- the four programs do not operate independent of one another, or stand alone, they are all inter-connected;

- candidates coming from the BIBCO and CONSER institutions are always also NACO contributors, and are also often SACO contributors – some significant level of representative balance was inherently achieved by the nature of how the programs are constructed and inter-connected;

- the chairs of the PCC standing committees, who also have voting authority in PoCo, actively represent more granular needs related to specific programs – rarely, if ever, has program-specific advocacy had to come from those originally elected to represent a program on PoCo.

Impact of emerging data structures on PoCo: In order to advance PCC in some strategic areas, PoCo is also realizing the need to integrate critical expertise and leadership from beyond the cataloging and technical services professions in order to add diversity to PoCo's collective knowledge, to challenge operational norms and status quos, to grow PCC in new functional areas beyond those managed through the four programs, to expand the numbers and types of institutions contributing to PCC initiatives, and to provide sustainability to PCC over time.

Recommendations and Actions: With these realities and strategic imperatives in mind, the PCC Steering Committee recommended and approved at its 2016 meeting moving away from the program-specific model of representation on PoCo to an "at-large" model. Those currently serving on PoCo will continue to fall under the structure to which they were originally elected, until the end of their term. However, starting in spring 2017, vacancies on PoCo will immediately become "at-large" positions, and candidates will be derived from leaders in the PCC community as a whole. We will no longer impose a structure that requires program-specific affiliation, but instead PCC affiliation more broadly. It is expected that this model will help alleviate the continual struggle to identify appropriate nominations and willing candidates from institutions contributing to the smaller programs. It will also provide flexibility for PoCo to draw upon and recruit from a more diverse range of expertise and leadership skills that may reside within and across PCC-member institutions, and thereby supplement our strong cataloging and technical services leadership with perspectives from emerging areas in the field, or required to meet specific PCC strategic directions.

Proposal for Modifying the Representation Structure on the PCC Policy Committee

Things that will change:

- Effective spring 2017, all community-elected positions on PoCo will serve as "at-large" representatives. Rather than being slated under a single program on the ballot (BIBCO, CONSER, NACO, SACO), candidates will represent PCC-member institutions and the PCC as a whole.

- Depending on the needs of PCC at any given time, the Steering and/or Policy Committee, may ask the Nominations Committee to recruit from leadership at PCC institutions who have not themselves overseen traditional cataloging or technical services operations. These leaders may be recruited from fields like 'big data' management, digital collections management, institutional repositories management, or may have broad administrative expertise in such areas as strategic planning, or fundraising and donor relations.

Things that will remain the same:

- Candidates must come from PCC-member institutions.

- Candidates must be policy-setting personnel of PCC-member institutions in order to be eligible to run for PCC Policy Committee.

- The number of community-elected positions will generally be nine (though in some years this total number will fluctuate slightly because rotating members of the Policy Committee can also serve simultaneously as Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past Chair, resulting in a variation in the total number of voting members on the Policy Committee.).

- The positions will continue to be staggered, in order to provide continuity and institutional memory over time.

- Term limits will remain the same: three-year terms, with the ability to serve no more than two consecutive terms.

- Currently-elected members of the Policy Committee will continue to serve in the same capacity under which they were originally elected. Their positions will not flip to "at-large" until the end of the current term.

- These changes affect *only* the rotating voting positions on PoCo. There are no changes to the structures that govern representation from the permanent voting members (Library of Congress, British Library, Library and Archives Canada, OCLC), the chairs of the three Standing Committees (Standards, Training, Automation), nor the advisors and liaisons (ALCTS, ISSN, CC:DA, MARC Advisory Committee).