

AI3 - Request to allow cataloging at branch or affiliate sites.

A library system requests that properly trained staff at affiliate libraries be allowed to add item holdings to Evergreen records. Staff members would be given proper authorization to only add holdings. They would not be given permission levels that would allow them to edit existing records or bring OCLC records into the PINES database. They believe that: "This is feasible now that the database has been cleaned up. The majority of ISBN searches results in a single, usually accurate, record".

They propose that the regional cataloging coordinator would be responsible for training and

"Staff members would not have access to Z39.50 for importing records, nor would they be allowed to edit MARC record.... With these restrictions we believe possibility of damage to any records or any other library's holdings is minimal."

The current policies this would alter are:

Chapter 3 Cataloging Functions in Multi-Site Library Systems

All cataloging functions carried out in a system should take place at the headquarters location. This practice applies to both multi-county systems as well as to single county systems that include more than one site. The exception to this would be if a cataloger from the headquarters office traveled to a branch to undertake a special bibliographic project. This type of activity should always be of a temporary nature.

5.3 Non-adherence to Established PINES Cataloging Policies

The following situations could cause a PINES system to be declared non-compliant. [NOTE: Additional conditions might be added to this list as new situations arise.]

- Not reading messages posted on the Cataloging Listserv (CAT-L) and/or not following the instructions/requests stated therein
- Not being familiar with and following established standards (listed at the beginning of this Policy document)
- Refusing to follow established PINES policies and procedures
- Allowing Cat1-level work to be done by a person who has not been adequately trained
- Allowing cataloging work to be done in the branches (other than by visiting catalogers from the central office who are working on special projects)

Suggested wording for proposed changes to these sections:

Chapter 3 Cataloging Functions in Multi-Site Library Systems

All cataloging functions carried out in a library system will be coordinated and monitored by the regional headquarters library director and cataloging coordinator (CAT1 designee). This includes all cataloging

functions, such as editing existing records, bringing records into the PINES database from OCLC, database maintenance functions and other tasks needing Cat1 training. This practice applies to both multi-county systems as well as to single county systems that include more than one site. If necessary to alleviate backlogs an individual PINES library system may train branch or affiliate library staff to add library holdings to existing PINES records, with responsibility for the accuracy of the work residing with the system director and cataloging coordinator. The system cataloging coordinator would be responsible for training local staff in MARC formats, matching parameters and other applicable PINES policies and procedures. The decision to allow copy cataloging at a branch or affiliate will be at the discretion and control of the headquarters staff.

The PINES Director and Staff reserve the right to revoke any/all cataloging permissions if any work threatens the integrity of the PINES database. The PINES Executive Committee will be consulted and informed of any such decisions.

5.3 Non-adherence to Established PINES Cataloging Policies

The following situations could cause a PINES system to be declared non-compliant. [NOTE: Additional conditions might be added to this list as new situations arise.]

- Not reading messages posted on the Cataloging Listserv (CAT-L) and/or not following the instructions/requests stated therein
- Not being familiar with and following established standards (listed at the beginning of this Policy document)
- Refusing to follow established PINES policies and procedures
- Allowing Cat1-level work to be done by a person who has not been adequately trained
- Allowing improperly trained or supervised staff at affiliate libraries or branches to add holdings to existing PINES bibliographic records.
- Compromising database integrity by poor quality done by catalogers within or on behalf of the library system.

Georgia Public Library Service Regulations/Rules for State Aid January 2003

Any changes in PINES policy will also have to be accompanied by changes in the Georgia Public Library Service Regulations/Rules for State Aid January 2003

(http://www.georgialibraries.org/lib/publications/trusteemanual/appendices/Appendix_B.pdf) . A request to change this rule will need to be made on the part of PINES.

PLS-6-2-.01 Requirements for Public Library State Aid Grant Funds

(2) REQUIREMENTS

(j) The headquarters library in the public library system shall acquire, catalog, and process all library materials for the region, including all gift materials meeting the board-approved materials selection policy donated to any library in the system.

Committee Vote and selected comments

The Cataloging Subcommittee recommends not to allow this change in PINES policy by a vote of 6 NO and 5 Yes.

6 No – Selected comments:

- I reject the proposal!!
- FRRLS Administration and Tech Services discussed this proposal this morning. FRRLS would prefer that we continue adding items in Tech Services as usual and vote no to the recommendation. Accountability is better maintained in the building since the supervisor in Tech Services and the Director are ultimately responsible for the condition of the database.

I'm assuming that most systems try to maintain the same call numbers for identical items in their holdings. Therefore anyone in a branch who adds gift copies would have to agree to maintain consistent call numbers and item attributes on system holdings will become confusing. FRRLS is still performing major database cleanup in our collection. Whenever we add items to the collection there are many cleanup functions that may have to be done to a record. Regional staff knows that they must correct the record and the holdings for the entire system not just one library. Are branch managers willing to commit that much staff time so that an item might be added on site?

A good deal of money was spent cleaning up the database. Time is precious now—imagine trying to handle quality control over several libraries as well as vendors.

- I vote "no." I just see way too many ways for Not Good things to happen without a senior cataloger on site to supervise these new CAT2s or whatever they're going to be classified as. Even if they're just adding holdings, even if the regional coordinator remotely checks their work, it just seems a dangerous slope to me. How is the regional coordinator going to know if they're putting books on the right records? Sure, they'll have been trained by the coordinator and during training I'm sure it would be fine, but what about on an ongoing basis when they're at the branch on their own? The coordinator won't be able to double-check work with item in hand (if necessary) because the item will be at the branch.
-
- I also vote no. Our library system actually allowed this in pre-PINES days, but as of now I am still cleaning up a truly awe-inspiring number of mistakes from that time period.

5 Yes Selected Comments:

- Yes, I am very much in favor of this change as long as copy catalogers are well trained and supervised.

I do have one concern. The 2005 revision of PINES Cataloging Policies states "ALL cataloging functions carried out in a system must take place at the Headquarters location (this is the State Law)... Please see the attached scan, under the heading Cataloging functions in Multi-Site Library Systems for the full details. The 2008 version omits mention of state law.

Was the law changed?

- ARLS has no problem with properly trained personnel adding copy to records in PINES. Of course, the library's Cataloger is responsible for overseeing and training.
- I have been following the discussion and I am ok with the proposed changes as long as staff are properly trained and the responsible Cat1 checks up their work. My Cat2s add new magazine issues to records I have already imported. They go from a list of ocm/ocn numbers. I run reports monthly to check their call numbers and circ modifiers to make sure nothing is amiss.
- I vote yes.

Even though my library won't chose do that, other library systems may have the option (with well trained staff) since it's limited to only adding holdings if a record is already in PINES.

If a library system chooses to exercise that option, I would assume the library would maintain consistency for call numbers and in other cataloging matters across their library system – if they didn't, their local catalog (and shelves) would be messy and I would think they wouldn't want that.

- I vote yes, but it should be up each individual region as to whether they want to allow certain branches to do it.

Our regions are diverse. I think many don't realize that there are some highly trained catalogers working in our branches... yet I cannot add a simple copy because I work in a branch? I'm sure there are others out there in PINES-land who are qualified as well and would be easy to train on Evergreen to add copies.