

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

1

Agenda: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PoCo-agenda-2008.pdf> [PDF 1.03 MB / 33 pp]

RDA update and testing

Beacher Wiggins and Barbara Tillett gave a timeline for the next steps in RDA development and testing. At the end of the constituency review period, the JSC will revise RDA and issue its first release. Testing and assessment of the results will follow. The Library of Congress, National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine are developing testing criteria to address numerous issues under the broad topics summarized here:

- The needs of users, staff, systems, and institutions beyond libraries to use RDA in their respective tasks
- The interoperability of records produced by RDA and by AACR2/MARC
- The feasibility of preparing systems prior to implementation
- The costs of a new tool, training, and implementation

Action:

The three lead institutions for RDA testing will choose participants from a cross-section of PCC libraries, archival community institutions, commercial vendors, ILS vendors, and OCLC.

1. The Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) will work with LC Coop staff to identify non-MARC community testers to be involved.

Who: Joan Schuitema and Carolyn Sturtevant (and other Coop staff)

Note: The LC/NAL/NLM tentatively plans to hold a session "by invitation only" at 10 am Sunday morning, Jan 25, with prospective RDA testers to be identified and contacted in the coming weeks.

The Task Group on the Internationalization of the Authority files is co-chaired by Joan Schuitema and Barbara Tillett. This group is reviewing current models for an international authority file and will identify pros and cons of each in terms of feasibility for PCC participation. They will address subject as well as name authorities. Through the use of weekly teleconferences, they will prepare a report for January 15, 2009.

Provider Neutral E-Monograph record report

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf> [PDF: 853 KB / 20 p.] .

Outcome: There was overall support from PoCo, but there were questions that need to be clarified.

Actions:

SCS will gather its remaining questions and comments and share them with the Task Force. This does not need to be a formal report.

Timeframe: SCS comments to TF: by the end of Nov. **Status: Done**

Final version available for general comment Dec. or early Jan.

Final operations level discussion at ALA midwinter.

Final approval by PoCo February 2009

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

2

BIBCO Record Requirements BIBCO Standard Record

Recent events prompted discussion of a single encoding level for BIBCO records:

- The success of the CONSER Standard Record
- Discussions among members on series statements in monographic records
- The work of the BIBCO Materials Training Materials group

The PoCo perceives a trend toward greater emphasis on access points and a diminishing dependence on cataloger-supplied descriptive elements for monographs. This argues for the replacement of BIBCO's Full and Core levels by a single encoding level. For some resources, it is hard to recognize the difference between full and core bibliographic treatment by catalogers and those who train them. Defining a single "floor" level could be sufficient. Libraries could add other elements of value to their own collections. PoCo recommends that the issuance of revised BIBCO Training manuals be delayed pending the consideration of a single encoding level by a new task group. The PoCo wishes to move this issue quickly, and will include a variety of stakeholders in the new task group. BIBCO members will be included in opportunities to comment as a model is developed.

Decision: Form a group to explore this. Each SC should have a liaison, other members were suggested by PoCo

Action: Steering Committee will draft charge and run it by PoCo.

Time frame: COIN staff will draft charge for Steering Committee in December. Draft will include charge, timeframe, decision-making process

Series

Discussion of the PCC series decision focused on the steps needed to implement the new policies.

Actions:

1. Update BIBCO and CONSER documentation, revisions can be posted to the web first for quick access. Other documentation (print manuals, Cat Desktop revisions) may take longer to update.
Who: SCT Rebecca Uhl coordinates, works with Coop staff, BIBCO manual team, CONSER members, Bruce Johnson for Cat Desktop questions
2. Examine all the series related web pages on the PCC web site for overhaul
Who: Antony Franks, Hien Nguyen
3. After updates have been completed provide CETM with appropriate information for updating the CLW Fundamentals of series authorities workshop
Who: Coop staff

Assessment/Stats

We find it easier to count statistics than to assess the PCC programs. Current PCC Statistics procedures collect and display data on records contributed by member institutions in specified programs over given periods of time. PoCo members offered several ways that they use PCC stats locally:

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

3

- One points to LCSH proposal stats that support the original cataloging of theses. Failed searches in the local OPAC prompt this LCSH activity.
- One issues lists of new LCSH headings related to the local collection.
- One compares local work with output from similar institutions.
- One uses PCC stats to demonstrate eligibility for grants, and to show value-added service for special collections.

The plan to improve the PCC Assessment/Stats environment raises questions such as:

- Can PCC count records derived from PCC headings, as well as the original contributions?
- How can PCC use numbers and narrative to tell the story of PCC activity?
- Assuming that PCC records reduce work for other libraries, how can the savings be measured?
- Can PCC display stats on our many training sessions and measure their effectiveness?
- How can PCC stats be used in marketing the programs to potential members?
- How should PCC present other benefits of participation when assessing PCC?

(Examples: PCC members work with other professionals; a group approach solved the Vendor-neutral record problem; PCC committees work on creation of standards)

Action: By mid-January, COIN will send a questionnaire to PoCo to solicit answers for the questions and to gather additional ideas for making PCC stats displays more effective.

1. COIN welcomes PoCo members to send additional ideas after the meeting.
2. COIN will send PoCo a questionnaire to respond to. The point is to gather additional ideas on PCC assessment, publicizing the PCC, telling our story.
3. Consider asking a small group of PCC libraries to monitor the number of PCC records used as copy to identify savings from using PCC records
4. Develop approaches to assessing PCC training effectiveness (studies, surveys, other)

Timeframe: Begin work Dec. 2008

Who: Judith Cannan, COIN staff

Decision Making

The group had productive discussions on the need for all levels of the PCC to have a clear understanding of how task force reports are vetted and how final decisions are made. There are several different sources of task group reports, they result from operations group meetings or initiatives, standing committee deliberations, PoCo meeting results, or the steering committee on behalf of PoCo. Decision making at the policy level within the PCC needs to strike a balance between nimble decision making and assuring appropriate consultation with stake holders. The lines of decision making therefore differ for a

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

4

particular task force or project, but should be clearly described in the charge and assure that the interests of appropriate stakeholders have been considered.

Actions:

1. Examine governing document to find gaps in decision making process and formalize where needed. Send to PoCo for comment.
Who: Anthony Franks, Coop staff
Status: Guidelines for Standing Committees and Task Groups have been updated and sent to PoCo for approval. After approval, the appropriate web site needs to be updated by Coop staff.
2. Make sure every task group charge has clear instructions for decision making and consultation by appropriate groups
 - a. Create and post a task group charge template
 - b. Create spreadsheet of past and active task groups for public posting
Who: Coop staff
Status: As of Dec. 1, 2008 Coop staff have drafted a task group "charge template" an existing spreadsheet of PCC task groups has been located (but still needs to be updated).

Dublin Core/MODS pilot. Discussion of the BIBCO/NACO report raised the idea of exploring the inclusion of metadata in Dublin Core and MODS formats as a category of PCC records since several PCC member institutions contribute records in these formats to OCLC already.

Actions:

1. Put out a call for institutions interested in testing/working on requirements for contributing DC and or MODS records to BIBCO and CONSER
 - a. **Who:** David Banush will ask the Standing Committee on Automation to coordinate a study to answer these questions:
 - i. Are there enough BIBCO and CONSER libraries creating records in DC and or MODS to make them useful if PCC authenticated?
 - ii. How could they be contributed as PCC program records?
 - iii. How/could they be used?
 - iv. Other questions provided by COIN staff?

OCLC Report

Cynthia Whitacre reported that nearly 500,000 records have been modified in the non-Latin pre-population project and that pre-population would be completed within weeks.

OCLC contracting services and OCLC CIP partners have incorporated the practice of not using the now obsolete 440 field in favor of 490/8XX and have clarified that member institutions may implement this as well. OCLC has decided that it will change 440 fields to 490/8XX combinations in existing records but has not established a timeline for the work.

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

5

The next MARC update will be sometime between February and June 2009 and will incorporate all MARC changes in recent updates.

The Expert Community Experiment will begin in February 2009 and last for six months. The project allows all full level authorizations to upgrade any level record except PCC records and is intended to open up record modifications to a wider group of users.

SACO action item

PoCo selected John Mitchell to be the PCC representative to SAC.

IFLA report

The PoCo agreed that the secretariate should pursue the contacts identified in the report. The PCC Steering Committee has agreed that regular funding of a PCC representative was impractical and noted that several PCC representatives attend IFLA regularly as a part of OCLC, LC or other institutional representation.

Standing Committee on Automation (SCA)

Adolfo Tarango reported that the SCA would like to request updating of the PCC PURLserver along with the other PURLserver update work at OCLC.

Action: Cynthia Whitacre noted the request and is taking it back to OCLC as a formal request.

Standing Committee on Standards (SCS)

Joan Schuitema reported that the SCS is recruiting members for the non-Latin script task group that have wide language skills. Please contact Joan with ideas for nominations.

Standing Committee on Training (SCT)

Rebecca Uhl reported that she will be sending out a call for additional members for the SCT.

Note: The full reports of the standing committees, operations committees, LC secretariat, and the IFLA report are available from links in the PoCo agenda:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PoCo-agenda-2008.pdf> [PDF 1.03 MB / 33 pp]

Other Standing Committee Actions:

1. Coop staff: will confirm that rosters of standing committees are complete, contain names of PoCo liaisons **Status: still requires action as of Dec. 1, 2008**
2. Mission statements: At the beginning of each, include "Under the guidance of the PCC Policy Committee ..." **Status: Done**

**Summary and Action items from the PCC Policy Committee (PoCo)
Meeting
November 6-7, 2008**

6

3. Send revised mission statements back to PoCo for approval **Status: Done**
4. Develop a "cheat sheet" for incoming Standing Committee chairs that outlines the work of the chair, the establishment of task groups, the lines of communication, etc. Would be useful for incoming chairs and would serve as a reference when questions arise about the origins of a task group, lines of communication, etc.
Status: still requires action as of Dec. 1, 2008

Status of Task Force on Normalization Report:

Action: Coop staff will work with Dave Reser, Policy and Standards Division to finalize and post final approved version

PCC response to the LCWG

Action: David Banush will draft a brief PCC response, pass it on to PoCo for approval, COIN will post the final draft on the PCC website.

Status: The statement was written and sent to PoCo and the PCC email list. As of Dec. 18th it has not been posted to the PCC web site.

Strategic Plan

Action: OCLC discussion in December, three or four ideas were mentioned. People who raised them will write a summary of their idea and send it to David Banush by November 21st.

Status: Done

The strategic plan discussion also resulted in several possible actions to help keep PoCo more engaged in the future directions of the PCC. Some of these ideas were:

- Ask OCLC for an update or report on the OCLC Next Generation Cataloging project. The project makes use of ONIX for books data and involves several people from PCC institutions.
- Ask the LC PCC Secretariat to poll PCC member institutions about the involvement of staff in metadata related projects and working groups. The information may be useful for identifying projects that should have fuller PCC participation or support.

Status: No action agreed to by PoCo for these items. The PCC Steering Committee can revisit these topics for possible action at its ALA midwinter meeting.

CCQ special issue on cooperative cataloging

Actions:

1. Rebecca Mugridge will send invitations for abstracts in Nov./Dec.
2. Antony Franks will suggest an author for the SACO abstract
3. Judith Cannan will work with NUCMC staff for an abstract **Status: Done.**

Charge for Non Latin Documentation TF:

Action: Draft received from Joan Schuitema (sent to David Banush Oct. 31, 2008) will be sent to PoCo for approval when the final draft is available.