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How Much Will It Cost?
Making Informed Policy Choices Using Cataloging Standards

By Roger M. Miller, Catalog Department Manager, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County

What are cataloging standards? Well, in addition to the actual definition, most of us probably know that “cataloging standards” is about the last thing that our colleagues in public services or administration like to hear. It is one of the immutable laws of nature that the phrase “We have to do it this way because of cataloging standards” is guaranteed to produce eye-rolling, if not outright disdain for catalogers, on the part of many reference librarians. And who can blame them? Very often, in their experience, the reason behind every “no” answer from the Catalog Department is an invocation of some mysterious cataloging rule, regulation, or imperial decree.

Yet, we as catalogers know that our work, especially in a shared cataloging environment, would be rendered impossible without adherence to cataloging standards. And how could a library user or reference librarian reasonably expect good results from the catalog if we didn’t use rules and standards? So what are standards, and more importantly, how can we use them to implement cost-effective cataloging policies, especially in the lean times in which we currently find ourselves?

Standards in general are simply rules that have been established to provide guidance or to serve as a model or example. Cataloging standards are reflected in rules for providing description and access (AACR2), rules for formatting MARC 21 records (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/nlr0xx.html), and similar standards that apply to users of bibliographic utilities such as OCLC (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/tables/). Both of these MARC sources identify two types of records: minimal and full level. Another type of standard—the so-called core record—is available for the various formats at the Program for Cooperative Cataloging website (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pec/bibco.html). Libraries may also develop local standards that are applied in their particular environment. For example, you may choose to add more than the required or typical number of access points to the record for an item of some particular local interest.
How does a library select the standard it wishes to apply? Which standard is best: minimal level, full level, PCC Core, or some local standard? If your library hasn’t consciously selected a standard as a matter of policy, odds are the catalogers themselves have taken care of it. One of the truths that we have observed over the years is that, as nature abhors a vacuum, so do good catalogers love long, excruciatingly perfect MARC records. And why not? There is no question that a full level record is more useful than a minimal record, if it can be afforded! We have noticed over the years that as our online systems became more sophisticated and allowed longer records, we began to experience “standard creep.” This is to say that, over a period of time, the typical record (especially in specialized formats) became longer and increasingly complex, which of course means that the per-item cost of cataloging has increased as well.

In 2001, the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County (PLCH) received a large gift of over 6,200 jazz recordings on compact disc. We would not have been able to absorb them into our normal processes and complete the project in any reasonable length of time, and funding for outsourcing was not available. Clearly the only way to expedite the project was to adopt a lower cataloging standard, which would require gaining support from various stakeholders in the library. All parties involved—catalogers, reference librarians, and probably patrons as well—had over the years come to expect our very lengthy, complex, and detailed bibliographic records for sound recordings. Involving these stakeholders in selecting from the various policy alternatives would be the key to finding a viable approach and ensuring the long-term success of the project.

The question was how to go about doing this. As indicated at the top of this article, talking about cataloging standards (especially in the abstract sense) is generally something to be avoided in the local setting. A different, more hands-on and illustrative approach was needed. We decided to undertake a cost analysis of the various cataloging standards for sound recordings to provide the information that would be needed to make the decision.

A sampling of a subset of the recordings showed that as many as 38% might require original cataloging. For the purposes of our study we focused on original cataloging. The first step was to develop a table of MARC tags required by each of our possible standards (OCLC Level K, OCLC Level I, PCC Core, and PLCH). In general these four standards represent a continuum from the shortest record (OCLC Level K) to the fullest record (PLCH). Before we actually applied these possible standards to our cost study, we identified a possible new standard that we dubbed “Level K-plus,” to be used on sound recordings with some local connection. This standard was essentially OCLC Level K, but included performer notes and added entries for locally significant persons or entities.

A few recordings were selected and our cataloger prepared original cataloging for each title using the OCLC Level K standard. Her process for each title was timed from start to finish, and then each record was printed. Each record was then upgraded step-by-step up through the cataloging standards, making printouts and taking timings along the way. The timings were averaged and a cataloging cost was then determined using the cataloger’s hourly salary (benefits were not included in our cost analysis). Table 1 lists the five cataloging levels we used, general characteristics of the cataloging levels, and the average time and salary cost required to catalog the items. Average times ranged from 15.75 minutes for OCLC Level K to 37.25 minutes for our local PLCH standard. We found that
our local standard was costing on average $8.47 more than OCLC Level K. Adding locally significant performers to the minimal level records increased the cataloging cost by just under $1.00 per title. The largest gap in time and money occurred between PCC Core and the local PLCH standard ($5.42); there was less than $1 difference in costs between each of the other cataloging standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT. LEVEL</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level K</td>
<td>Minimal Level</td>
<td>Basic author/title/pub info. Includes 546 Language Note, 500 General Note providing format info, 700 key Personal Name Added Entry, no Subject Added Entry</td>
<td>15.75 min.</td>
<td>$6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level K+</td>
<td>Minimal Level Expanded for Local Connection</td>
<td>As above with 511 Performer/Participant Note and additional Personal Name Added Entry if local connection, one 650 Subject Added Entry</td>
<td>18.25 min.</td>
<td>$7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Full OCLC</td>
<td>As above with 246 Varying Form of Title, 518 recording session info., 508 production info., additional 650 Subject Added Entries, additional 700 Personal Name Added Entries for producers, etc.</td>
<td>21.5 min.</td>
<td>$8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>PCC Core (LC)</td>
<td>As above with additional 500 General Note describing accompanying material, 505 Contents Note</td>
<td>23.5 min.</td>
<td>$9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLCH</td>
<td>Current Library Practice</td>
<td>As above with additional 500 General Note describing minor attribution, additional Performer/Participant Note listing all musicians, additional 650 Subject Added Entries, 700 Personal Name Added Entries for all musicians</td>
<td>37.25 min.</td>
<td>$14.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Cataloging Levels at The Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County

With this cost analysis and the printouts in-hand, we were able to provide our stakeholders in administration and public service departments with easily understandable examples for each level of cataloging. A pack of records was produced for each title with the costs marked on the printouts, so it was very simple to quickly see how much actual quality and content one was getting for the cataloging dollar. We determined that Level K-plus would provide adequate and affordable cataloging for our jazz collection. We also were forced to acknowledge that “standard creep” had taken us well beyond the requirements of both the OCLC Level I and PCC Core standard. This extra cost could not be justified, especially in our current funding environment, so we have since adopted the PCC Core standard for cataloging most of our sound recordings. As a direct result of this decision, in 2002 we were able to completely eliminate our backlog of uncataloged sound recordings and are now well on our way with cataloging the jazz collection.

The cataloging we produce for our jazz collection, while correct and standards-compliant, is unquestionably much less complete than that for all other new recordings that we catalog. We are comfortable with this because the policy decision was based upon a careful, reasoned examination of the cataloging standards and the costs associated with each. Involving our public service stakeholders and cost analysis in the policy decision has helped us attain maximum “buy-in” for the cataloging policy that was selected.
Perhaps more importantly, an adequate and feasible approach was implemented that is enabling us to provide our users with the materials they want in less time and at a lower cost.

**Technical Services 2003 – Inspiration, Example, Synthesis**

Do you need professionally re-energized? Are you feeling that your work has been underestimated and misunderstood by others at your library? The Ohio Library Council’s TS Division presents *Technical Services 2003 – Inspiration, Example, Synthesis* on May 7 - 8. Come join us at this two-day retreat at Mohican State Park featuring Janet Swan Hill, Tschera Harkness Connell, Diane Mayo, Margaret Danziger, Jennifer Bull, and many other fine speakers and facilitators. We will gather technical services managers and technical services staff together to focus on enhancing skills, affirming the value of our work, and instilling a sense of personal worth in those who perform it. It’s not too late to register. Click on [http://www.olc.org/WorkshopDescription.asp?ID=218](http://www.olc.org/WorkshopDescription.asp?ID=218) for more information.

**Do you Enjoy Indexing?**

The TS Division is looking for someone who really enjoys indexing. We are indexing the *TechKNOW* archives on the OLC web page, providing detailed access to these valuable back issues. This volunteer job also has an on-going component, as indexing will be needed for issues as published. The successful applicant will have a hand in planning the project as well. Contact Margaret Maurer at mmaurer@lms.kent.edu or at 330.672.1702, or Joanne Gilliam at jcegilliam@aol.com if you are interested.

**Contacting Your Technical Services Division Representatives:**

**COORDINATOR:** Joanne Gilliam, jcegilliam@aol.com  
**ASSISTANT COORDINATOR:** Bonita Doepker, Dayton Metropolitan Library, doepker@dayton.lib.oh.us  
**PAST COORDINATOR:** Jennifer Bull, Ashland Public Library, bullje@oplin.lib.oh.us  
**SECRETARY:** Laura Salmon, Akron-Summit County Public Library, lsalmon@asclp.lib.oh.us  
**ACTION COUNCIL:** Laura Casey, McKinley Memorial Library, caseyla@oplin.lib.oh.us  
**ACTION COUNCIL:** Elizabeth Milburn, Greene Co. Public Library, emilburn@mailserv.gcop.lib.oh.us  
**ACTION COUNCIL:** Roger Miller, public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, rogermiller@plch.lib.oh.us  
**ACTION COUNCIL:** Jane Myers, Westlake Porter Public Library, Jane.Myers@westlakelibrary.org  
**ACTION COUNCIL:** Louisa Kreider, Cleveland Public Library, Louisa.Kreider@cpl.org  
**TECHKNOW EDITOR:** Margaret Maurer, Kent State University Libraries and Media Services, mmaurer@lms.kent.edu
Bring Out the Ohio Bicentennial in Your Catalog

by Jeanne Poole, Assistant Manager Technical Services / Catalog, Toledo-Lucas County Public Library

Ohio’s bicentennial is here, ready to be celebrated by governmental bodies, organizations, schools, social groups, and your library. As catalogers, we can make a very definite impact on what our communities know about Ohio history and their local history, and help them discover the treasures hidden in their local libraries. Not me, you say! We don’t have anything in our collection that dovetails into the bicentennial celebration. Assuming that we did have those kinds of materials, how would we get that knowledge out to reference staff and to the public?

Our first step is to secure the involvement of the reference staff and the administration. We need their cooperation and help in discovering existing cataloged materials that deal with Ohio history, and with local history. Then we need to uncover the uncataloged materials tucked away in the library and the community that deal with state and local history. This is also an excellent way of involving the community in the workings of the library. Encourage people to donate or lend their historical treasures to the library. As part of that discussion we must link these materials to library programs and school assignments. What will community groups be looking for? What does the library see as its role in celebrating the bicentennial? What kinds of resources do we have access to that other community groups do not? And finally, what kinds of assignments will teachers be developing using the bicentennial theme?

Existing cataloged materials are the easiest to deal with. Once we know what they are, we, along with reference staff, can check them for local interest points. Since many older materials have brief bibliographic records, we can enhance them with more specific call numbers, with additional subject headings, and with notes bringing out materials relevant to the bicentennial and to the community. For example, if your library is in Northwest Ohio, add subjects for the Battle of Fallen Timbers, for Oliver Perry, for the French and Indian Wars, and the Old Northwest to history books. Holmes County area libraries can scour their collections for missed access points to the Amish, their history, traditions, and culture. Books that focus on parks, zoos, natural areas and attractions, architecture, and other information dealing with the area and its culture could draw attention through the use of summary and contents notes and local subjects. The same access points can be applied to works of fiction. Does your library own novels set in your area? If so, add a 651 to bring out that aspect of the book. Everyone loves to read a novel set in his or her community and then compare it to the reality.

The most exciting part of this historical journey, however, is discovering the treasures that exist in your library that only a few staff know about. Need some examples? What about that photograph collection that was given to your library and have been stored in a box or a file folder for years? Or that collection of local and area newspapers, newsletters, and other publications that has been languishing in an office or a file? Does your library share space with a museum? Can you work with them on cataloging materials and providing links to their exhibits through your online catalog? Diaries, correspondence, newspaper clippings, magazine articles, scrapbooks, art work, pamphlet file materials, portraits, a doll collection, books, articles, papers, and travelogues written by local people, obituary files, historical collections of books, that either focus on your area or were collected by a member of the community and then donated to the library, needlework, sound and video recordings of local celebrations, oral histories, stained glass...
windows either made by local artists and/or depicting important events in the community’s life, catalogs and programs from county fairs, community programs, vintage clothing, art exhibits, histories of churches, schools, and other community organizations, and that collection of school yearbooks. The possibilities are infinite, are unique for each library, and will provide new windows into understanding state and community history and the impact these histories have on our lives today.

Now that the staff and the community have gathered materials from all corners of the library and their homes and have filled your entire workstation with them, they are clamoring for access to them. Where do you start? By doing what catalogers do best: sorting, categorizing, and prioritizing. Put like materials together; define their common points; determine what kind of catalog record you need? If the value of the items extends beyond your community, should you add them to a utility such as OCLC? Or is their value so intrinsic to the community that you would want to add them only to your local catalog? Will your online system enable you create a template for each kind of material and use that template to create complete records? If not, can your information technology staff, a computer-literate staff member, a friend, family member, or tech-savvy patron help you create these templates?

Once they’re completed, you can begin to create bibliographic records. Like any good record, these will contain the basic fields: call number, author, title, publication information, and physical description. The remainder of the record is your opportunity to be creative and to bring the state and local history aspect of these materials to the forefront. Your grouping of these materials may enable you to create a series based on content or skill or creator. The 5xx notes will provide a showcase for additional creators, ownership, provenance, reasons for creation, complete and accurate descriptions of the item (e.g., a wedding ring quilt done in blue and white cotton. The blue material has flowers sprinkled in it. The couple’s names and wedding date are embroidered in the lower right-hand corner.), and a place to indicate which of the creative people involved are also residents or former residents of the community. The 6XX and 7XX fields will provide local subjects and added access points for these pieces of history.

When creating the records, a significant part of the work is authority control. Many of the authors, illustrators, craftspeople, artists, locations, buildings, natural resources, etc. will not have authority records in your online catalog, in the Library of Congress catalog, or in the authority records supplied by your online vendor so you will need to create them. Guidelines are available in chapters 21 through 24 of AACR2R. Examples can be found in the Library of Congress authority records and in the online catalogs of a library that you find trustworthy. After studying these materials, you may need to rely on local reference materials, such as the city directory, the local phone book, and the area’s newspaper(s). If these sources are of limited help, call the organization/business/government agency and ask them for their official name and for a chart of their organization. If the creator of a work still lives in the community, contact them; if not, contact a family member. Once the needed information has been gathered and verified set up your local authority files. Be sure to include the correct name, any variant forms you may have encountered in your search, and where and how you verified the accuracy of the information.

At long last, the records are completed. The reference staff and patrons have a greatly enriched online catalog. The community has an increased awareness of the depth and breadth of the area’s history and culture. You and your staff have made a valuable contribution to the celebration of the bicentennial and have helped increased understanding of state and local history. Your work is done. Or is it? Now that these
artifacts and pieces of history have been uncovered and spread out for the community’s enjoyment, you might want to take the next logical step in the process by creating a digital record of these treasures and linking them to their bibliographic records. But that’s another story for another time ….

Ohio Valley Group of Technical Services Librarians Conference

The 2003 OVGTSL conference will take place May 14 - 16 at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. *Racing to a bright future* will feature programs on catalog enrichment, integrating web sites into the OPAC and inventing the new technical services librarian. Local tours will also be available, including one of the Cunningham Memorial Library’s Preservation and Conservation lab. OVGTSL draws its members from Indiana, Ohio and Kentucky, and rotates its annual conference between the three states. For more information on the 2003 conference just click on [http://panther.indstate.edu/ovgtsl/](http://panther.indstate.edu/ovgtsl/) or visit the OVGTSL website at [http://www.wku.edu/Library/ovgtsl/Home.html](http://www.wku.edu/Library/ovgtsl/Home.html).

AUTOACQ-L

AUTOACQ-L is a brand new discussion list, created for librarians and others interested in the automation of library acquisitions. According to Marc Truitt, one of the founders of the list, AUTOACQ-L grew out of talks at an ALCTS acquisitions discussion group meeting, when participants didn’t want to stop the conversation at meeting’s end. Although only created in February 2003, at last count there were 856 people subscribed to AUTOACQ-L. Despite that large number traffic on the list has been relatively slow, and the discussion, although un-moderated, has remained focused.

List founders hope that discussions will include traditional library ordering and receipt across all physical and intellectual formats, and also “fiscal and budgetary issues, collection development/ management, vendor performance monitoring and a broad spectrum of reporting issues” in the automated environment.

To subscribe, send a message to: [listserv@listserv.nd.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.nd.edu). Inside the message type: subscribe autoacq-l <your name>.

Lavender’s *Basic Book Repair* provides information for the novice mender as well as the experienced bindery supervisor or conservator. Based on the author’s extensive expertise and sound conservation principles, it is also easy to read, clear in its instruction, and practical in its application. The very first chapter provides a really nice book repair decision flowchart that shows considerable respect for the local conditions that impact book repair decision making. There is also a careful explanation of the principles of conservation, including the principle of doing the least harm.

Repair procedures are carefully explained and include lists of supplies, easy-to-follow step-by-step directions and references to other helpful sources of information. Everything from repairing torn pages to complex hinge and spine replacements are described. A list of needed tools is provided.

The author devotes a chapter to detailed instructions on what to do in the event of a flood, including a listing of disaster recovery specialists. There is a section on the treatment of water-damaged books including information on removing mold and mildew. The book has a bibliography, an index, and several appendices that provide information on supplies and suppliers, including contact information. The only obvious criticism is that some of the drawings are frankly primitive, and some of the photographs are actually out of focus. In defense of the drawings, however, they do isolate specific points that the author wants to illustrate.

All in all this book is authoritative, accessible and useful, and would benefit librarians in many types of libraries.

**Coordinator’s Corner**

It is April Fools’ Day as I write this, but no fooling, we have 65 people already registered for our workshop at Mohican State Park on May 7 - 8. I talked to our keynote speaker, Janet Swan Hill, a couple of weeks ago and she is very excited about her role in the workshop. The good reputation of Ohio libraries and librarians reaches all the way to Colorado! There is still time to register for the workshop if you haven’t already done so. Don’t miss being a part of what should prove to be an informative and rejuvenating event.

Moving to other Division business, we have assembled our slate of candidates for the upcoming election. We thank those who volunteered to run for office. In these tight economic times, we truly appreciate people who are willing to volunteer their time and energy for the TS Division.

Our Division is contemplating indexing the past and future issues of TechKnow. I’d be interested in hearing your thoughts on the proposal and also interested to learn of anyone who might be able to help with the project.

We are about to publish a third poster/outline aid for the cataloging of materials by format. This poster will cover the cataloging of spoken audiocassettes. I thank Roger Miller of the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County for his work on the poster. We are also thinking of re-issuing the first poster we did on the cataloging of books. Does the membership support a re-issue of this poster?

I am energized by the people I work with on the Technical Services Division Action Council and by the help of the staff of OLC. Don’t be faceless in this professional
organization of which you and I are a part. Participate on whatever level is comfortable for you.

Until the next coordinator’s corner or until we meet at Mohican State Park, may you enjoy peace and fulfillment.

Joanne Gilliam, Coordinator

MARC 21 Lite??

By Margaret Beecher Maurer
Cataloging Manager, Kent State University Libraries and Media Services

Readers of Library Journal have been entertained lately by Roy Tennant’s arguments regarding the future of MARC. Tennant really believes that MARC is doomed, and needs to be replaced by XML. Several recent columns have been dedicated to the topic, including one on potential exit strategies from MARC. Meanwhile, at the Library of Congress (LC), Jackie Radebaugh and her colleagues at the Network Development and MARC Standards Office have been quietly creating MARC 21 Lite, a leaner, stripped-down version of MARC21.

It is important to think about this new subset of MARC21 in the context of Tennant’s objections to MARC’s complexity, and the growth and development of various new types of metadata, including Dublin Core, all of which tend to be less complex than MARC. Tennant feels that MARC is too complex in ways that do not help its functionality. Catalogers know that MARC is complex because sometimes it must to be complex to describe the item in hand. But sometimes we really don’t need a complex record. Sometimes we are describing something that is so ephemeral, so transitory, so uncomplicated that it simply doesn’t warrant even a minimal level record.

Currently many libraries meet these needs by using circulation functionality in their automation systems to create extremely brief records. Unfortunately these records sometimes don’t function in our automated systems as well as full bibliographic records function. For example, they may not index appropriately and therefore cannot be found by patrons when searching. We may also have difficulties carrying them forward with us into future library systems. As a subset of MARC21, MARC21 Lite may be a solution to some of these problems.

Another reason why the Library of Congress created the Lite standard is to provide a simpler data format that would allow less developed countries to easily share bibliographic data with the rest of the world. According to Jackie Radebaugh MARC21 Lite “is a version of MARC trimmed of all but its essential elements, allowing libraries around the world to easily access and use the format.” Most of the less developed world is using ISBD or their own specialized subset of MARC21 to catalog their materials. According to Ms. Radebaugh “Libraries from developing countries were sending [LC] their subsets.” By designing the Lite standard LC has provided a baseline that can be built on by these libraries. The expectation that it will be built on is evident by the presence in the Lite format of a link at each field to the same field in the full format.

Within the United States there are many libraries that could use MARC21 Lite. According to Radebaugh, “LC had small libraries in mind when they created the Lite format.” School libraries or other extremely small libraries could use this as their default
data-format standard. Other libraries could use this standard for certain materials within their collections, instead of circulation records. As a subset of MARC21, Lite is fully compatible with MARC21.

The Lite standard does, however, have its limitations. For example, considerable fixed field data in the 008 field is replaced by fill characters, and the 006 and 007 fields are not included in Lite. Therefore libraries could not use MARC21 Lite to describe audio-visual materials that they wanted to include in statewide resource sharing (the MORE Project) without adding this fixed field information to their local standards. Only the 440 field is included for series entry. Libraries that want to express more complex series relationships would need to add additional fields to their local standards. Finally, libraries using the Lite standard that want to enhance it locally must go to the full formats to identify where to put the data. There is no indication within the Lite format of absent fields that are part of the full standards.

But for the right library, or the right situation, these limitations will not be important. Librarians who are interested in exploring this new data format further can go to http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/lite/, or can contact the Network Development and MARC Standards Office at the Library of Congress.
Vote for Your Candidates for TS Division Office

The following people have graciously agreed to run for Technical Services Division office. Please take a moment to read about them before you cast your vote in July.

Running for Assistant Coordinator:

**Judy Aldrich**, Technical Services Supervisor, Toledo-Lucas County Public Library: I think the Technical Services Division should work to promote fellowship between TS departments across the state; forming a network of expertise. We should form partnerships with library suppliers who will listen to our needs. We must also keep other library departments aware of the importance of their respective technical services departments, reminding them that we are the backbone of every library system. Without us, there would be no material to circulate. A lot has been done in the past few years to promote technical services. We need to continue to educate all levels of library personnel.

Running for Action Council:

**Kathy Hughes**, Librarian Cataloger, State Library of Ohio: One-person libraries and other small libraries have always found it difficult to keep up with the latest developments. Now, with the present financial situation, even large libraries may be feeling that professional development is low on the priority scale. I believe that the Technical Services Division should be finding ways to provide training and information through novel means such as Web tutorials so that technical services personnel can continue their education as they have the time.

**Donna Shuman**, Cataloger, Westerville Public Library: I think the Technical Services Division should continue to provide information on new formats and technologies, as well as provide more workshops and break-out sessions at conferences. It is also important to increase contact with its members. This contact is already informative, but it also should be fun and help to promote the image of professionals and paraprofessionals in Technical Services.

**Sevim McCutcheon**, SEO Catalog Librarian, SEO Library Center: I think the Technical Services Division should work to provide continuing education to Technical Services staff at a variety of levels, from relatively inexperienced to experienced. I believe that communication with Public Services staff and understanding of our respective roles in a library is important because it leads to better service to patrons.

**Marilyn Spence**, Assistant Head, Catalog Department, Cleveland Public Library: I think the Technical Services Division should emphasize continuing education of technical services staff at all levels. Professional development of current staff and the encouragement of technical services careers in library school would help assure quality and consistency of access to library materials in the future for all Ohioans.

Running for Secretary:
Jennifer Kolmes, Assistant Manager, Catalog Division, Columbus Metropolitan Library: I think the Technical Services Division should help the membership position itself for an active role in defining the library of the future. By offering timely workshops and a forum for provocative discussions, the division can help prepare us to respond thoughtfully to the many challenges facing today's libraries.

Laura Salmon, Librarian, Akron-Summit County Public Library: I think the Technical Services Division should promote more interaction among public service and technical service librarians, since libraries depend on both areas of library service working together. I also think that the division should continue to emphasize training and communication among technical service librarians around the state, especially with the recent and impending changes in cataloging rules, new software options available from OCLC, and other technical service issues.

Favorite sites: Lynne’s Web’s - Library Cataloguing Aids
http://www3.ns.sympatico.ca/allegrow/cat.htm

This is an amazing sight! Gathered together in one place is a long, delicious, hodge-podge of web site links for catalogers; everything from the good old standards to fresh new material. The page is not organized in alphabetical order. In fact, disorder appears to be the norm, a refreshing change for a cataloguing web page, and one that works because it is a fairly selective collection.

There is a good sprinkling of extremely timely and current sites including links to information about DDC 22 and the impending ISBN changes. Links to sites dedicated to specialized forms of cataloging include a guide to cataloguing MP3 files and the Union List of Artist Names Browser. There are links to cataloguing aids for talking books. There is specialized information for Canadian catalogers, but also plenty of links to information at the Library of Congress.

Library Cataloguing Aids is the brainchild of Lynne LeGrow, a Cataloguer at Halifax Regional Library in Nova Scotia, Canada. She has maintained the page since 1998, making changes and verifying links most recently in April 2003. This collection is colorful and fun, with jokes and quotes and lots of moving graphics, but it also contains timely, useful and authoritative information. It’s really worth a visit.

Cataloging Integrating Resources? NOTSL Spring Program will show you how: