

**Art Libraries Society of North America, 33rd Annual Conference  
Hilton Americas, Houston, Texas, April 1-6, 2005**

**Cataloging Problems Discussion Group  
Tuesday, April 5, 2005, 8:00 - 9:15 AM**

**Chair:** Sherman Clarke, New York University

**Recorder:** Elizabeth Lilker, New York University

**Minutes:**

Introduction: Sherman Clarke, New York University, welcomed the attendees. The meeting was attended by approximately thirty-five people. Sherman noted that RLG staff would be attending the meeting and the usual question and discussion format would be interrupted.

Kay Teel, Stanford University, incoming chair of the Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) began by describing the revision process of AACR3. Daniel Starr, Metropolitan Museum of Art, is the ARLIS/NA representative to the CC:DA, the group within the American Library Association (ALA) that is responsible for the ALA comments on the draft document. Daniel had compiled the comments of the CAC and submitted the response to CC:DA before ALA midwinter.

Abby Bridge, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, spoke of needing a subject heading for "vernacular photography." A broader discussion ensued on the possibility of creating an Art Building Names or Art SACO funnel group, similar to the existing Art NACO funnel. Danny Fermon, Museum of Modern Art, mentioned a problem when updating subject headings leads to a split catalog. Several people mentioned their policy is to accept copy as-is, leading to continual maintenance. Others mentioned that this was also the case with copy cataloging at their institutions. Lori Ann Thorrat, Cleveland Museum of Art, reported that at her institution, cleaning up older headings was not seen as a good use of time. Another person pointed out, that with split files and hyperlinked headings in an OPAC, users could be misled as to the number of total headings for a particular subject. Lori also mentioned training issues with converting to Library of Congress classification. Danny Fermon said that MoMA had recently gone through a similar situation. Another point was made that artists who had previously been in an A to Z scheme could potentially be classed throughout the N schedule.

Margaret Ford, Museum of Fine Arts,, Lea Whittington, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, and Julia Wisniewski and Isabella Marques De Castilla, Library of Congress, all spoke of accepting more copy at their institutions. Isabella also talked about LC updating NAF records, adding 670s when appropriate. She also mentioned that the time needed to differentiate personal names could be lengthy. Ellen Corrigan, University of California, Santa Barbara, asked about cataloging art exhibition catalogs. Kay Teel responded that a goal of the CAC would be to finish the exhibition guidelines. ARLIS/UK has a guide available for ordering, Art Exhibition documentation in libraries : cataloging guidelines. (<http://www.arlis.org.uk/publ/artexorder.html>) Alexis Curry, Los Angeles Museum of Art, asked about cataloging artists files. Several responses to her question mentioned the use of volunteer staff for this work, including the use of in-house

templates. Maria Oldal, Pierpont Morgan Library, said this kind of local documentation would be helpful for other institutions. [After the meeting, Mark Bresnan, Frick Art Reference Library, volunteered to coordinate gathering the documentation].

Lorna Corbetta-Noyes and Pamela Dewey of RLG, gamely wearing t-shirts with targets on the front, came to speak to the group. They reported that SCIPPIO was working, the Union Catalog had seen improvements in response time, and that problems continued to be addressed. The NACO test client software was soon to be distributed and had been viewed by a few ARLIS attendees in the exhibiter's hall. Several questions were asked regarding the number of records in the save file that had already been produced. Mark Bresnan mentioned the apparent disappearance of the "find add" command. Lorna and Pam reported that command line searching had been problematic.

Lorna suggested that people continue to monitor the RLG page for Post-Migration Services Updates ([http://www.rlg.org/en/page.php?Page\\_ID=400](http://www.rlg.org/en/page.php?Page_ID=400)). She also suggested that specific questions could be sent to RLG through the feedback link or directly to RLG Information Center (RIC) staff. At this point, there were several comments that RLIN21 users were discouraged by the slow response time and other problems. Attendees felt that since it was so time consuming, it was not incumbent upon the users to report problems to RLG.

Several people reported that their institutions had delayed using Marcadia while the RLG Union Catalog was down.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 AM.