Copy Cataloging Working Group Final Report

Name of working group: **2CUL Copy Cataloging Working Group**

Phase 1 Report
July 31, 2013

Leads: Irina Kandarasheva (Columbia-chair), Cynthia Rich (Cornell)

Other members: Sarah Elman (Columbia), Pedro Arroyo (Cornell)

The following report is a summary of the Phase I 2CUL CCWG findings, detailed inventories and/or description of policies, procedures and workflows can be found in Columbia and Cornell 2CUL copy cataloging group comprehensive reports:

2CUL Columbia copy cataloging group report

2CUL Cornell copy cataloging group report

I. Summary of staffing and expertise at the two CULs, including a comparison of current job assignments

While the overall numbers of staff involved in copy cataloging activities at Columbia and Cornell are comparable (see Columbia Central TS, Starr East Asian, and Cornell org. charts) it is not easy to assess staffing levels in terms of FTE because Columbia's copy cataloging operations are more centralized than Cornell's. At Cornell there are 35 staff members performing inputting and fastcatting and 4 copy catalogers, at Columbia there are 25 copy catalogers. There is a difference in major responsibilities as well. At Columbia copy catalogers are support staff performing mainly cataloging activities: inputting minimal level records, backlogging, performing copy and sometimes original cataloging. At Cornell these tasks are more aligned with position titles: copy cataloger and inputter/fastcatter. The main difference in staff distribution is that at Columbia most staff perform only cataloging related duties while at Cornell many of the fastcatters and inputters have other Technical Services related responsibilities (e.g. receiving, ordering, physical processing, database maintenance, etc.)

Cornell cataloging staff have more expertise in a variety of languages especially non-Roman script languages (see Cornell language chart). The expectation at both institutions is that copy catalogers will catalog in languages they're not proficient in. Also in general Cornell cataloging staff unlike Columbia's have expertise in other areas of Technical Services, e.g. some Cornell cataloging staff include various aspects of ordering (including e-book ordering) and receiving, batch processing, metadata management and other Technical Services related duties.

Some Cornell copy cataloging staff are also responsible for hiring, managing and supervising student workers which is done at Columbia mostly by professional librarians.

Most of the cataloging related job responsibilities are very similar although at Columbia some copy catalogers are assigned cataloging belles lettres to pcc level including creation of authority records and contributing to NAF. Another difference in staff assignments is that at Cornell the Copy Cataloging Unit is expected to work in all formats including electronic resources while at Columbia cataloging different formats is a specialized task and sometimes performed by professional catalogers.

II. Summary of reporting and decision-making structures related to copy cataloging activities at the two CULs

Direct reporting structures at both institutions are well represented by the Technical Services organizational charts (see Columbia Central TS, Starr East Asian, and Cornell org. charts)

Staff generally report to a direct supervisor, who in turn reports to a director of a division or department. At both institutions there are cross departmental /divisional meetings and committees charged with deciding cataloging policies and new procedures as well as creation and changes in local cataloging documentation.

At Cornell these are the LTS heads and Cataloging Workflow managers' meetings. At Columbia these are BSCDG (Bibliographic Services Collection Development Group) directors and Catheads (cataloging managers) meetings. There are also internal divisional meetings of supervisors and directors determining the procedures and workflows on divisional/departmental level.

There are similarities at both the direct reporting lines and in having overseeing bodies/committees deciding on institutional cataloging policies and workflows. The general reporting lines are somewhat different because at Columbia copy cataloging activities are more centralized and concentrated primarily in the MPS division, at Cornell with the exception of the Inputting and Copy Cataloging Unit they spread throughout Technical Services groups and departments.

At both institutions communication is encouraged not only between staff members and direct supervisors but also with higher management and across divisions/departments. It seems at Cornell the relationships between professional and support staff are less formal, and staff may occasionally receive instructions or guidelines from managers other than their direct supervisor.   There are "open office hours" and "drop in" sessions for members of the Senior Management Team and the Associate University Librarian at Cornell to communicate informally with staff and more casual staff conversations with Technical Services directors at Columbia.

III. Summary of significant similarities and differences between policies, practices and workflows at the two CULs

Both institutions have extensive local cataloging documentation online. Columbia's manuals are divided by format and function while Cornell's documentation is kept together and accessible through one main web page. The main in house cataloging manuals are CPM (Cataloging Practices Manual) at Columbia and Cataloging & Metadata procedures at Cornell. (Columbia East Asian Library maintains some documentation modified from CPM for CJKT languages.) Most Cornell documentation is available publicly while some Columbia cataloging manuals and documentation are password protected. (This phase of the 2CUL project didn't result in satisfactory access of Columbia documents for Cornell colleagues). At both institutions cataloging training is done in house and requires extensive preparation and local documentation. At Cornell cataloging documentation is reviewed annually and if necessary, updated. At Columbia CPM documents are created and edited as needed, and posted online upon Catheads approval.

Columbia and Cornell have different strategies for handling materials that could not be fully cataloged on receipt. At Columbia for more than 20 years the Precat and more recently since 2009 the Offprecat circulating backlogs were designed to provide quick discovery of new materials for patrons. At Cornell this goal is fulfilled mostly by the Class on Receipt workflow which also is intended to make materials available to patrons as quickly as possible.

For the last three years Columbia actively implemented shelf ready services for domestic imprints through YBP with the goal of expanding them in the future to new subject areas and/or vendors. Cornell and Columbia's East Asian Library currently work with the University of Hong Kong Library on receiving some Chinese materials shelf ready. Both Cornell and Columbia use vendors (e.g. Casalini, Aux Amateurs) to receive full bibliographic records with new print materials.

At Columbia all paraprofessional staff are unionized, there is no union at Cornell. The union contract at Columbia governs many internal policies and has effect on copy catalogers' job descriptions.

At Columbia most staff perform only cataloging related duties; with the exception of East Asian Library where acquisitions and cataloging tasks are combined in the job description. At Cornell the new model involves some cross-training between units.

At Columbia some copy catalogers catalog belles lettres materials to pcc level and contribute name authority records and call number proposals to the NAF and others catalog certain materials to full level (variant edition, special languages/subjects). At both Cornell and Columbia original catalogers may catalog copy, and at Columbia some copy catalogers perform original cataloging. At Cornell copy catalogers do some original cataloging, such as belles lettres, or if some element in the bibliographic record does not match the item and predicates a new record.

At Cornell, copy catalogers catalog all formats, at Columbia copy cataloging non-print formats is a specialized task sometimes performed by original catalogers.

In general, at Columbia compared to Cornell there is less language expertise, and some copy catalogers have language expertise lacking in original cataloging (e.g. Hebrew, Arabic)

At Columbia student help is generally not used for copy cataloging activities, except for special projects. Cornell hires students for cataloging related jobs, in particular fastcatting (students generally do not input records because it requires a higher level of training).

During the 2010 reorganization at Cornell, the copy catalogers moved to Acquisitions forming a unit which also includes inputters. This move has fostered better communication between Cataloging and Acquisitions. The reorganization resulted in adding acquisitions and batch processing tasks to copy catalogers' responsibilities. An additional benefit is that Acquisitions staff now have improved access to cataloging expertise and areas where training is needed are more apparent.

IV. Summary of dependencies and limitations inherent in working with other functional units at the two CULs

In general, copy cataloging workflows at Columbia are designed and perfected over the years to avoid double handling of materials. The following are interdependencies rather than limitations in processing new materials: all materials (with an exception of East Asian) are received through either MAS (Monographs Acquisitions Services) or CERM (Continuing & Electronic Resources Management Division) and routed for copy cataloging to MPS. Some materials (e.g. Avery, serials, non-book formats, music) are routed directly to OSMC for copy/original cataloging. Rush materials and some other categories are routed from MPS to OSMC for original cataloging when needed. Bibliographic record loads are handled mostly by the Libraries Information Technology Office (LITO) and MPS supervisors are notified and copied with reports. Cataloging efficiencies at Columbia are sometimes inhibited by demands for service exceptions.

Materials at Cornell are brought to copy cataloging by inputters/fastcatters. Excluding belle lettres which are handled by copy catalogers, inputters /fastcatters route Items lacking subject headings, to Physical Processing whose staff places them in the storage presses and the original catalogers may do full, minimal level or class-on-receipt cataloging; copy catalogers as well do class-on-receipt (Cornell book workflow chart). All formats with copy are handled by copy catalogers. Rush cataloging goes to a prominent shelf for both original and copy catalogers to retrieve. The inputters in the Copy Cataloging and Inputting Unit as well as other Acquisitions and Batch Processing staff do bulk record loads. The level of cross-training makes units quite interdependent and enables team work.

While the functions performed in copy cataloging are essentially the same, both institutions have distinct workflows to achieve effective processing. At Columbia the interdependencies with other units and departments are based on acquisitions to cataloging workflows and reflect more centralized organizational structure. At Cornell copy cataloging activities are more dispersed throughout Cataloging, Acquisitions, Database Quality and Physical Processing units and more aligned with the functions of these units/departments.

V. Summary of available or easily derivable baseline productivity numbers at the two CULs

While both Columbia and Cornell use online statistics macros to record cataloging activities, and use 948 field in the bib to record it, Cornell has more detailed and faceted statistics recording than Columbia. For example, Cornell generates reports using the statistics macro to distinguish between formats while Columbia statistics are kept only for level of cataloging (except for East Asian Library where statistics for formats are also maintained semi-automatically).

- Attached spreadsheets for Columbia cataloging statistics (2010-2013):

- Columbia overall copy and original statistics

- By language

- By format

- Attached spreadsheets for Cornell cataloging statistics (2010-2013):

- Cornell overall copy and original statistics

- By language

- By format

Generally, copy cataloging statistics at both institutions reflect the number of materials received in a certain period of time. The combined copy cataloging numbers at Columbia for MPS, OSMC and EAL are about 100,000 a year (not counting backlogged materials in Precat and Offprecat). At Cornell the fastcat and non-fastcat categories comprise approximately 60,000 titles a year.

Cornell maintains more detailed statistics for different formats. Even though both institutions maintain statistics for different formats, most materials at both institutions are received in print. The significant difference in copy cataloging different formats is the expectation at Cornell that copy catalogers handle all formats while at Columbia some of the non-print formats are cataloged by original catalogers.

There are similarities in copy cataloging by language. Both institutions copy catalog English language materials at higher rate than any other language, which is followed mostly by Western European languages (Spanish, French, and German) as well as Slavic, East Asian languages, and Arabic. Cornell, unlike Columbia copy catalogs a significant number of materials in Southeast Asian languages which reflects collection development policies.

Because of the different organizational and functional structure related to copy cataloging activities in both institutions, it is difficult to assess baseline productivity numbers for copy cataloging positions broken down by specific task.

VI. Recommendations regarding a work plan and critical issues to explore in Phase 2 of the group's assignment

- Possible documentation sharing especially related to RDA training for copy catalogers

- Collaboration on general training of copy catalogers

- Assessing impact of specific areas of 2CUL collection development integration on copy cataloging workflows and practices at both institutions

- Possible consolidation of the efforts of the 2CUL copy cataloging working group with either 2CUL original cataloging working group or the 2CUL receiving working group

- Plan for the Columbia 2CUL copy cataloging group to visit Cornell in the fall of 2013