



To: Nancy Williams, coordinator
✓Mae Clark
✓Suzanne Brown
Pam Cenzer
Blake Landor
✓Leilani Freund
✓Bob Singerman
✓Jean Bostwick
✓Mary Ann O'Daniel
me
From: Martha Hruska, Sam Gowan, Carol Turner
CT by SR
Subject: Task Group to draft LC letter on Series Authority proposal

With this memo, we ask that you serve as a task group to draft a letter of concern which the UF Smathers Libraries can send out under Dales' signature to the Library of Congress. Nancy Williams and Mae Clark have volunteered to provide a draft for consideration. We believe UF should ask for a slower implementation of LC's proposed decision to cease establishing Series Authority Records for any numbered series which LC does not classify as a set. We also may want to suggest that LC continue tracing numbered series on the bibliographic records for all series classed separately. The letter will cite instances where the authoritative form of series entry is critical to retrieval and where this would be lost according to the proposed new policy. The letter will also propose development of a cooperative Series Authority decision making process, so that these treatment decisions and the supporting authority records would not be exclusively made by LC.

Background information is attached for your review. Nancy Williams will coordinate the process of incorporating your feedback on the letter we want to send. Our goal is to send the letter to Library of Congress, with copies to ARL and CONSER, by Jan. 28.

Thank you in advance for your contributions.

Please contact Nancy as soon as possible with your willingness to serve and your schedule availability early next week. Nancy's phone is 2-0351 and her e-mail is nanwill.

cc: Dale Canelas
Michele Dalehite
Carol Drum
Jim Gates
Deborah Rinderknecht
Lenny Rhine

DRAFT

University of Florida Libraries has begun some preliminary discussions of the impact which LC's proposal for not-tracing classed separately series would have on the Libraries and their patrons. Some early comments have been received from public services librarians in the Marston Science Library. Following are several of their concerns:

"The science library staff voiced serious concern regarding the elimination of series titles as access points. In nearly every subject area selectors could recall examples of monographic series that are frequently recognized and searched by series title. In the sciences, many numbered monographic series are indexed and abstracted as if they were periodicals. In other words, the abstract will cite only the series title, volume number or year and page number. Chemical Abstracts has an editorial policy that states no authors or editors of volumes will be included in the citation."

Some further discussion has addressed how research libraries in the US might cooperatively contribute to more of the series authority work in both bibliographic and authority records. Many of the ideas hinge on network cooperation and capabilities. Two are following:

1. DLC # DLC records are locked/unchangeable. Could these records with non-traced series be a different encoding level and also be enhanceable? Maybe follow the cooperative CIP model?

2. Could the creation and maintenance of series authority records become a more extensive cooperative project? Maybe follow a CONSER-type mode? *f*

Draft
1-19-94

Series Comments

A variety of opinions have been expressed by public services and technical services librarians on the utility of controlled access points for series including both numbered and unnumbered series. Many of these opinions seem to be influenced by subject orientation and the frequency of series citations from indexing tools. Based on a three-week analysis of currently imported LC Series Authority records, we had the following breakdown: 60.5% numbered and 39.5% unnumbered.

We have also analyzed 100 LC series authorities already resident in our data base. They are categorized as follows:

The 100 LC Series Authority Records (SARs) divided into 62 numbered series and 38 unnumbered series which is close to what we see as a percentage breakdown in our current importation of authorities. Of the 100 only 10 were classed together. (One appeared to need a class together treatment although the LC call number (050) is missing on the authority. A partial analysis would seem to indicate serial treatment which would need to be in a classed together run.)

We further analyzed the provision of cross references in 4xx's as well as the Source items for the series establishment (670s). These are charted.

SARs	Unnumbered (38) % of 38		Numbered (62) % of 62	
no 4xx's by LC	16	42%	15	24%
have 430s by LC	18	47%	32	52%
have 400 or 41x by LC	14	37%	40	65%
400 or 41x refers to "generic" titles	4	11%	30	48%
have more than one 670	5	13%	14	23%

Of the 19 records with multiple 670s only 10 referred to variant titles that were supplied in 430s. One additional SAR had a 670 that supported a change in corporate body responsibility. Four referred to title changes that would necessitate a separate authority. Two of the SARs with multiple 670s seem to be carrying 670s that provide no additional unique information. Three of the SARs for numbered series did interestingly enough provide information that some of the publications lacked numbers.

It is interesting that 34% of the 100 series authorities had "generic" type titles, titles that are notorious for confusing cites and publisher variations. They represent 48% of the numbered series and 11% of the unnumbered. Another interesting figure is that 50% of the 100 SARs have one or more title cross references which in some online catalogs allow efficient search redirection.

Twenty percent of the SARs had 400-411 cross references to "non-generic" titles. Supplying this type of cross reference could be questioned. Also the 670s might be scrutinized. Nineteen percent of the SARs had more than one 670 but are they necessary to have on a record to support a 430. The 430s could be added as their need was identified - they may or may not even be on the publication(s). They could be titles used in citation tools, etc. A 670 that supports the addition of a 530 also seems redundant. Some of the information now recorded in 670s would be useful to record and not redundant in the record -- (1) the information about items coming with or without numbering, (2) decisions to change a 4xx to a 5xx and vice versa, and (3) publisher changes.

It is conceivable to realistically consider not tracing unnumbered series. No question probably would arise over the utility of individual titles being put together and cataloged as a serial. Also classing together is not usually attempted. If more than a few items are published in a given year even publication dates become meaningless as unique identifiers. Unnumbered series with generic type titles could easily be lost even with keyword searching unless extreme care was applied in providing author statements in the 490 0 series fields. For unique titles keyword searching would however be very successful.

Numbered series probably represent 60% of the LC series authorities we add to our data base. We do not always follow the same classification decision as the Library of Congress and for some subject areas we may analyze series that LC treats as serials. These exceptions are based on user request and patron or collection needs. Numbered series are very different from unnumbered series because they potentially can be handled in various ways by libraries. They also ~~process~~ ^{provide} an unique identifier; i.e. their individual numbers that can be used in citations as well as a notation of receipt in acquisitions records and invoices. Providing controlled access to numbered series in traced headings and using authority records to ensure consistency may prove to be worth the cost and effort in the long run for library staff and patrons.


We propose that the Library of Congress and other libraries could consider not tracing unnumbered series beginning July 1? Through 1994/1995 more careful thought could be given to numbered series. Possibly some streamlining of details now required on series authority records could be considered; cooperative efforts could be pursued and possibly put into place; and parameters might be considered and defined for numbered series that could reduce the number and situations in which authorities would be created. Perhaps even a definition of a minimal level Series Authority Record could be developed. Also situations could be defined where series authorities would not be created, e.g. numbered series might be traced, but authority records created only for series having numbers published in the last few years.

The Task Group on Authorities of the Cooperative Cataloging Council has conducted surveys and has issued a report. It recommends an orderly approach in which contributions could be made to a national authority file. Cooperative record building is also suggested. Time is needed to fully review the Task Force's work, to see what can be accommodated and put into effect within the existing networks and systems, and what is viewed as useful, necessary, and affordable in providing information and access. How series are used, the cost of creating their bibliographic control on bibliographic records and authority records, and the long term implications of changes need to be further explored by all providers of library information.



January 5, 1994

TO: Mae Clark, Nancy Williams

FROM: Pam Cenzer 

re: Library of Congress treatment of monographic series

The Series Group Report as an element of the Library of Congress cataloging program was discussed at this morning's MSL Management meeting. The science library staff voiced serious concern regarding the elimination of series titles as access points. In nearly every subject area selectors could recall examples of monographic series that are frequently recognized and searched by series title.

In the sciences, many numbered monographic series are indexed and abstracted as if they were periodicals. In other words, the abstract will cite only the series title, volume number or year and page number. Chemical Abstracts has an editorial policy that states no authors or editors of volumes will be included in the citation.

The critical link for the patron between the indexing sources and the libraries' collection is the series title entry. Simply transcribing the series from the volume is inadequate because so many series include generic titles which are buried in the hundreds of results from a key word search.

Consistency in treatment of series is extremely valuable to science researchers. Series title searches are used to track down latest volumes published, recent symposia held as well as to keep up with current research. If older volumes are traced and new volumes are not, patron confusion will be the result.

Local concern about series treatment can be seen by the number of requests for series to be classed together. The reason for this type of request is often because online access to the series is inadequate for some reason. With even less series access, selectors would see classification together as a means of locating series volumes. Since this type of local decision means more customized handling, our processing costs increase accordingly.

cc: Carol Drum