

Catalogue and Index

Periodical of the Chartered Institute of Library and
Information Professionals (CILIP)
Cataloguing and Indexing Group

Editorial

March 2012, Issue 166

This issue is focussed on two recent CIG events, one on shelf-ready and one on reclassification, which were held in September and December 2011. We bring you articles written by several of the speakers, based on their presentations on the day, and additional articles on reclassification projects at the British Film Institute and at De Montfort University. We also bring you news on developments in thesaurus construction, and a review of Vanda Broughton's new book, *Essential Library of Congress Subject Headings*. We hope that everyone will find something here to interest them.

All the presentations from both events are available on the CIG website here: <http://www.cilip.org.uk/get-involved/special-interest-groups/cataloguing-indexing/pages/presentations.aspx>.

Heather Jardine

(heatherjardine402@hotmail.com)

Cathy Broad

(library@ethicalsoc.org.uk)



Contents

2-4 Shelf Ready Processing
at Leeds Metropolitan
University
David Baron

5-6 CIG Shelf-ready Event,
London, Monday, 5th
December 2011
Christina Claridge

7-9 Shelf Ready Stock: A
Public Library View
Andrew Coburn

10-11 CIG Reclassification
Event – 20th September 2011
Helen Jarvis & Robin
Armstrong Viner

12-15 Slider Puzzle:
Reclassification at the
University of East Anglia
Andrew Barker

16-18 Turning NLM into
Dewey; re-classification of a
nursing collection
Lynne Dyer

19-23 ReGenreNation: the
revision of genres at the
British Film Institute
Marijose de Esteban

24-27 Guerrilla reclassifica-
tion: a call to arms
Deborah Lee

28-29 New international
thesaurus standard
published
Stella Dextre Clarke

30 Book review

Shelf Ready Processing at Leeds Metropolitan University

David Baron, Bibliographic Services Manager

Leeds Metropolitan University has been using shelf ready with our two main book suppliers, Coutts and Dawson, for about 10 years. By shelf-ready, we mean that the supplier:

- Applies all stamps (ownership, process grid, etc)
- Applies almost all labels (spine labels, collection labels, date labels)
- Inserts (but not programs) an RFID tag
- Covers or binds the book, if required
- Provides a MARC record which meets our specification, including a shelfmark (based on Dewey, and following our Cuttering rules) both in the record and on the spine label.

Orders are sent to the suppliers by EDI, and the exact processing required is specified through the holding code. It is also possible to use coded notes to specify exceptions – eg no spine label required for this item.

Over 85% of our material is received shelf ready; the other 15% is made up of out of print books, foreign languages, material which we have to buy from specialist suppliers (eg art catalogues), and non-book formats such as AV, maps, and printed music. Of the shelf ready material, only 2% needs to be seen by a cataloguer; this excludes authority work, which is done from reports.

The process we follow:

Academic Librarians select the books in conjunction with academics.

Electronic “selection list” orders are created by the Academic Librarians or Collections Maintenance teams; selection lists are a feature of the Symphony library management system which allow library staff to create batches of orders more quickly than creating them individually.

The orders are then placed by the Acquisitions team; the order includes the holding code, and this defines processing – eg type of loan (ref, 1 week, short loan – each with own stamps and labels), collection (general, law, EDC – different spine labels), location (HY, CC, CHC, staff copy – different labels).

Orders are sent each night by EDI, and responses are also received by EDI; we have so far not implemented invoicing, but we are currently looking into that.

Each day we check the suppliers’ ftp servers for new MARC records; each file of records corresponds to a consignment of books. The MARC records are loaded onto Symphony, and this prompts Acquisitions staff to unpack and receive the books, referring to the packing notes.

Once the books have been received, the RFID tags are programmed, and the books sent to the shelves. We have a service standard that 95% of shelf ready books should reach the shelves within three working days of being unpacked, and we have actually achieved 100% for the last few years; usually books are on the shelves within 24 hours.

Our Finance team receive paper consolidated invoices which are matched with the dispatch notes; we are currently looking at moving to EDI invoicing to streamline this process.

Acquisitions issues

- You need to order the right thing, with the right details! – this might sound obvious, but using EDI and shelf ready it is not always obvious that a mistake has been made until it is too late to rectify; suppliers will not accept returns of processed books unless you can persuade them that it was their error, not yours. Errors occur most often when the wrong ISBN is used – for the wrong edition, or the wrong format; suppliers, quite understandably, get confused when you are apparently asking them to label and stamp an ebook!

- Receipt relies on someone downloading the MARC records – this relies on the technology working (networks and ftp servers sometimes go down) and on there being someone available to download the records. Several people have the knowledge and the permissions to do this, but it is not unknown for them all to be unavailable on the same day, meaning that the records cannot be downloaded, and therefore the books cannot be unpacked and received.
- House style (fonts, size, alignment, position of labels, stamps and tags) – suppliers must be able to provide servicing which matches your existing house style, rather than you having to change to their standard.
- Exceptions – shelf ready works best when you can specify a limited number of standard ways of processing books; in our case, this is specified via the holding code which is transmitted to the supplier as part of the EDI order. However, there will always be exceptions to the standard processing, and there must be a way of transmitting information about this as part of the EDI process. The most common exception is additional copies, which do not require a record but which must have the same shelfmark as existing copies.
- Working with the librarians – historically, some of our Academic Librarians liked to do things their own way – eg re-writing parts of the Dewey schedules, creating local subject headings, or ordering from specialist suppliers. We have had to educate them about the costs (both money and time) involved in asking for non-standard servicing, or using a non-shelf ready supplier.

Cataloguing issues

- Standardisation – for shelf ready to be most cost effective, you need to keep manual intervention (either by the supplier, or by your own staff) to a minimum, and in order to achieve this you must follow the established standards as closely as possible. We have found this to be a particular issue with Dewey and LCSH; in the past, we used to truncate some Dewey numbers, but we now accept the full number as supplied in the MARC record – this is not always popular with the shelvers! We use Dewey Option A for Law, which requires manual intervention as records are not usually available with Option A numbers. Spelling can also be an issue – LCSH uses American spelling and terminology, and in the past we have Anglicised some of these headings; we have worked to reduce these, but there are still some headings which we feel would not be helpful to our students (eg railroads v railways). We also have some locally created pseudo-LCSH for topics which are not adequately covered.
- Authority control – we do our own authority control (following AACR2), so we need to bring headings in the suppliers' record into line. We do this from reports generated from Symphony.
- Cutters – We have our own rules for Cutters, which are probably over complex in some subject areas. This means that our Cuttering is often a manual process for suppliers, and they pass on the cost to us. We are working to simplify our Cuttering ; we recently revised computing, and we are looking at art and literature. The downside of this is that the existing material needs to be re-Cuttered, re-processed, and re-shelved, so we have to consider the costs versus the benefits.
- Local fields/notes – These are outside the scope of shelf ready processing; although we try to keep them to a minimum, we do still have some local notes – eg “Leeds Met author”, which also requires an additional label.

EDI

EDI is the key to shelf ready ordering; Symphony natively supports two EDI standards, X12 and 9XX – unfortunately, suppliers in the UK use a third, EDIFACT, which requires a certain amount of setting up on Symphony. It is not intuitive, and requires specific text to appear in specific fields of the vendor record; normally it does not need to be edited, but if some of the EDI details change it can be difficult to identify exactly where and how the change needs to be made.

EDIFACT relies on transferring data via ftp, and this can cause problems when servers are migrated, or permissions are changed, or servers are down. It is not always obvious when something has gone wrong. It is important to monitor system

reports, but even so a file can appear to have been sent OK, but it turns out it has not been received. The longer it takes to identify a problem, the more difficult it tends to be to resolve.

The Future

We have been using shelf ready for a number of years, and the process works well for us. This has, perhaps, led to a degree of complacency, and it may be time to re-assess our shelf ready processes and see if they can be improved or updated. Some of the things which are on our wishlist:

- Shelf ready supply of AV materials – with quality MARC records! Some suppliers have offered a partial service, but none has yet delivered a satisfactory product. The MARC record tend to be mapped conversions from other formats, and the quality is not acceptable.
- Out of Print – some suppliers can provide servicing for out of print books, but the timescales and costs involved in using their out of print services have proved prohibitive.
- Full EDI – we are currently working on EDI invoicing, and we are also considering EDI quotes.
- RFID initialisation – would it be practical for the suppliers to program the RFID tags as part of the processing?
- Investigate EDI quotes to allow us to order via the suppliers' systems.
- EDI with Swets for journal subscriptions – particularly invoices, which currently very time consuming to process on Symphony.
- Automate some of the manual processes – downloading records and receiving books on the system.

Conclusion

We have been using shelf ready at Leeds Metropolitan for about 10 years, and through various staffing reviews and restructurings we have reached a position where we could not operate without it. For the vast majority of the time, it works very well, but when problems do occur they can be difficult to spot, and time consuming to resolve. It requires effective communication between library and suppliers, and careful monitoring of the process – particularly the EDI elements.

d.baron@leedsmet.ac.uk

This event, organized by Katrina Clifford, was a great opportunity to discuss aspects of shelf-ready and to share experiences with fellow professionals. In this brief article, I will discuss the main themes that ran through the presentations and discussions. For a clear and comprehensive synopsis of the day, I would recommend the blog post of another of the attendees, [Hamideh Kasaey Fard](#).

The speakers were Janet Pryce-Jones, Chief Cataloguer at [Birmingham City University](#); Nathan Newey, Bibliographic Services Co-ordinator at the [University of Greenwich](#); David Baron, Bibliographic Services Librarian at [Leeds Metropolitan University](#); followed by Andrew Coburn, Acquisitions & Cataloguing Manager Libraries (Resources) for [Essex County Council](#). The final presentation was given by Fiona McCallum (Bibliographic Services Team Leader) and Keir Finnerty (EDI Support Officer/Cataloguer), representing [Ingram Coumts](#). The majority of people (19 of 24 attendees) represented College or University libraries.

The presentations highlighted three main aspects of the use of shelf-ready services: the importance of EDI (Electronic Data Interchange); the significant amount of work still done within the organisations; and the relevance of staffing levels of the bibliographical teams.

EDI (Electronic Data Interchange)

All of the speakers' libraries used EDI, either within their library management system, or through an additional system such as [Coumts OASIS™](#) or [EDIFACT](#). EDI facilitates the movement of information between library and supplier: information is first sent from acquisitions staff to the supplier, and the supplier responds by posting the shelf-ready books, and electronically transferring the bibliographic data back to the library. While classification was done by the supplier for some (Leeds Metropolitan University, Essex County Council), variations on this included the classification and record selection by cataloguers prior to ordering (Birmingham City University), and classification by subject specialists (University of Greenwich). Some libraries included invoicing in the EDI process (Essex County Council). The representatives from Ingram Coumts highlighted a sample workflow, which included the work done by the shelf-ready stock providers at the end of the process (cataloguing and processing stock). David Baron (Leeds Metropolitan University) highlighted during his presentation that EDI was the key to shelf-ready ordering.

Work within the organisations

The second theme of the presentations was the amount of work that was still being done within the organisation libraries. While shelf-ready processes do speed up the time from ordering to shelving, all of the academic libraries still did a lot of work relating to ordering, classifying and cataloguing stock. Shelf-ready stock was checked, usually on receipt, and passed to staff to deal with if the bibliographical record proved to be too brief or there were classification problems. The speakers from Greenwich and Leeds Metropolitan Universities both spoke about improving low quality shelf-ready records, and all the academic libraries still dealt with items that were outside the range of shelf-ready items, for example, works provided by specialist suppliers (Leeds Metropolitan University) or works that were in specific formats or that had special requirements (Birmingham City University).

The use of shelf-ready created more time for staff to work on qualitative tasks such as authority control, and the Q&A session also showed that shelf-ready had provided more time for reading list management and ordering at one organisation.

The exception to this theme was the experience of Andrew Coburn (Essex County Council) who spoke about how public libraries had experience with shelf-ready stock over the past 30 years. He described the process of 'direct delivery', where suppliers managed the whole process from selection of stock through to delivery of stock to individual branch libraries.

Staffing

The final theme that ran through the presentations was staffing, perhaps not surprising in the current economic climate. Both Greenwich University and Birmingham City University used acquisitions staff to check bibliographical records, and Leeds Metropolitan University used Collection Maintenance staff. Greenwich University have not replaced their full-time cataloguer upon his/her retirement, the work instead being done as necessary by the speaker, who was Bibliographic Services Co-ordinator. All three academic libraries had structures that combined the acquisition and cataloguing staff into one department. This impression of small numbers of staff managing outsourced work was further confirmed by a question at the end, asking if non-cataloguers catalogued books. The panel of speakers said yes, some branch libraries did, as did some acquisitions staff, and some specialists.

Andrew Coburn spoke about the future of staffing in public libraries, and about how shelf-ready practices could work in situations where libraries were privatised or run by volunteers.

It was also interesting to hear about the staffing situation of Ingram Coutts. Fiona McCallum (Bibliographic Services Team Leader) spoke about how they supply over 100 customers, and have a staff of 8 cataloguers and about 20 processing staff. Each customer library has a primary allocated cataloguer and a backup cataloguer.

Other interesting things

Some of the other noteworthy parts of the shelf-ready processes mentioned during the day were the various 'hiccups' with the system. Birmingham City University had retained complete control over the bibliographical information and the classification, and some of the other speakers highlighted problems that had occurred with the EDI system, or situations where generic standards conflicted with local practices (Dewey 23 or truncated classmarks, for example). The representatives from Ingram Coutts also spoke about the (free of charge) trial process for shelf-ready, and how it was shaped around the needs of the customer library.

Art and architecture books and audio-visual materials seemed to be the frontiers of shelf-ready cataloguing, as the Q&A session highlighted attendees who spoke about how these were the two areas where it was hard to find high quality (or any) records.

Conclusion

Overall, it was a very interesting day, with lots of people relating their experiences with shelf-ready suppliers. It was beneficial to have representatives of a shelf-ready supplier and a public library service present, as it provided a different perspective on the provision of shelf-ready books. It was also interesting to hear about the areas where even libraries with established shelf-ready practices were hoping to expand the service. My impression of the audience was that many were from libraries that had not adopted shelf-ready services, and hopefully the information from this event will allow them to see both the benefits and drawbacks of outsourcing resource provision.

I would like to extend my thanks to the organiser and compère of this relevant and valuable event, Katrina Clifford.

Bibliography

[Hamideh Kasaey Fard's Chartership Blog](#)

[Birmingham City University Library](#)

[University of Greenwich Library](#)

[Leeds Metropolitan University Library](#)

[Essex County Council Libraries](#)

[Ingram Coutts](#)

[The Beginner's Guide to BIC in Libraries, by Simon Edwards \(pdf\)](#)

[United Nations/Electronic Data Interchange For Administration, Commerce and Transport \(UN/EDIFACT\)](#)

[Coutts OASIS™ \(Online Acquisition and Selection Information System\)](#)

Shelf Ready Stock: A Public Library View

Andrew Coburn, Acquisitions & Cataloguing Manager, Essex County Council

From my observation of current discussion amongst academic librarians, public libraries have been further down the road of 'shelf ready stock' for some time. This article will give a little of the history that led to that and discuss how the landscape is changing for public libraries.

When I started in public libraries over 30 years ago, books arrived from library stock suppliers with many labels, such as date labels, spine (classification) labels, ownership labels or stamps already in place. Individual library authorities and, in some cases individual libraries, would then add their own finishing touches (medical books have a pink spot, books on the third floor have a red date label...) and the book would find its way to the shelf – or branch if being handled by a central delivery function. Later, when security systems came in, the tags for these had to be fitted as well.

Today the best organised libraries are having stock delivered direct to the branch for which it was ordered where staff simply unpack the box, scan the barcode and put the book (1) on the shelf. Even library services who have not got that far are recognising that the 'Spanish practices' that they used to have as in the previous paragraph, are unnecessary and expensive

But how did we get from there to here? Until the late 1990s we had the safety blanket of the Net Book Agreement (NBA) whereby most books could not be offered for sale at less than RRP (the price on the back of the book.) Libraries could obtain a Library Licence which entitled them to buy from designated suppliers for a 10% discount. This meant that although library suppliers were supposed to charge a realistic rate they could absorb the cost of the individual authorities' processing peculiarities in the difference between what they paid for the book and what they charged the libraries. Thus the supplier could do all the processing (including the pink spots and security tags) and in due course offer free catalogue records. Until somebody invented library management systems these were often bought as 5x3 cards from the British Library, HMSO or whoever, or catalogued by staff employed for the purpose. Which is how I got my start in public libraries! And added services such as help with promotional material and events would also be offered cheap or free by the stock suppliers. They could even afford to give away diaries, calendars etc in large quantities at the year end, sometimes to libraries who did not even use their services.

When the NBA fell apart, all that changed – to the extent that all but about three of the major public library suppliers are now history. Deep discounts could be offered but the (literal) price to be paid for that was an economic charge for processing the books and all the other services. Unsurprisingly suppliers were and are keen to support initiatives such as the National Acquisitions Group's standard servicing guidelines (2) so that they could eliminate unnecessary and costly practices.

On the other hand some of the benefits of technology came to the rescue of both sides. If you are not using Browne issue you don't need a date label with a pocket and the supplier can print them as required rather than having to stockpile materials for umpteen different services.

Similarly with catalogue records there are now several sources. Because they were being asked to provide records to libraries before the NBA went, most library suppliers have databases which adhere to MARC standards. They may get the records from a variety of sources including, but probably not limited to, BDS and Nielsen and most still employ at least some cataloguers to pick up the gaps. So libraries can still get the records from the stock suppliers.

But there are various other places – consortia such as Capita/ Talis and SELMS share the work and some library services still employ their own cataloguers – though I fear that this is a very small number of services (and cataloguers.)

Wherever they come from, the technology now allows bibliographic records to be created and updated at various points in the process. It is possible to receive or create them at the EDI Quotes or Order stage which, as most public libraries can now order ahead of publication, may mean an incomplete or inaccurate catalogue record produced from publisher's advance information. Since this is notoriously unreliable – authors, titles and even ISBNs may have changed when the book appears – it may be updated when the book is received in the library. The direct delivery to branches referred to

above does raise issues about whose responsibility it is to verify the accuracy and import the up to date record in these cases.

So what could – or should – Shelf Ready Stock be to public libraries in 2012? One thing has not changed – it should mean that the library service does not need to add anything to the book in terms of stationery – pink spots, RFID tags or anything else. It should mean that the book can be unpacked and put straight on to the shelves for the public.

It might mean different things when you consider how the book is shelved and/or how you find it in a catalogue. As far as I know, most public libraries in the UK still use the Dewey Decimal Classification scheme if only on the catalogue though I do know at least one using Library of Congress. In recent years there has been increasing attention to the idea of simplifying the arrangement on the shelf, if not on the catalogue, by using some form of categorisation. Some libraries have had in-house schemes and the growth of purchasing consortia has been a factor in producing shared schemes – the Central Buying Consortium (CBC) being a prime example.

Most recently the Book Industry Communication (BIC) (3) E4Libraries project is, at the time of writing, about to produce the Standard Libraries Classification (SLC). This is an attempt to use a subset of categories derived from the booktrade categorisation scheme to allow cataloguing utilities and record suppliers to create short category codes which suppliers can interpret to fix appropriate stickers to new stock – rather than have to know what the individual library scheme is or to have to store multicoloured /shaped and sized labels.

The SLC may not solve all the problems. There has been difficulty in coming up with a scheme that satisfies all children's specialists (book suppliers and librarians) mainly because of differing requirements to designate the reading age or reading level. A solution has been found though and it remains to be seen if it will be effective.

Another area where SLC may not be suitable is for local history material. Many public libraries have local schemes which designate material by parish or locality and may use ancient home grown classification schemes. At present I suspect those will remain in use.

SLC has a steering group which, once the scheme is published, will monitor its uptake and discuss any queries about the scheme which may arise from people using it in anger.

But what of the future? As mentioned above there are a number of actual or *de facto* consortia around. Most of them, such as CBC or the London Libraries Consortium, started by getting together to optimise their spending capacity by entering into joint stock supply contracts. However, now there are ventures such as the tri-borough scheme covering Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith & Fulham, which are more or less merging all their services, not least in the 'back office'. My own authority, Essex, has for some years had a joint arrangement with Southend and Thurrock, the services which became part of unitary authorities following Local Government reorganisation in 1998. We share a stock supply contract but also a library management system which encourages us to have common standards for servicing, classification and categorisation. There appear to be a number of other places where such collaboration is being actively discussed or may arise from such initiatives as the outsourcing or privatisation of library services.

So far there are relatively few of these in action – some library services run by trust, one by a private company (Hounslow by John Laing Services) and one by another local authority (Slough which is now managed by Essex.) If a 'market' develops and some organisations end up running disparate library services it seems quite likely that they will want to streamline operations so that costs are minimised. In which case as well as using the EDI and related technology to maximum effect, there may also be a wish to share operating standards.

In the extreme this could end up paralleling what I believe to be the model in the Netherlands and perhaps other continental European countries. A single library national procurement organisation standardises all servicing (including categorisation and spine labels) and a single national catalogue minimises the effort in that area. In the last few years (and before the recession really concentrated minds) a number of voices have been heard to advocate what has been termed a Library Development Agency for the UK which might undertake some of these tasks as well as providing leadership and guidance to public libraries in meeting the challenges of the current political, technological and social climate.

I am not advocating that solution in this article, merely pointing out an idea that has been promulgated, alongside more bottom-up solutions that are already taking place in public libraries and/or may yet come to pass. While digital services, especially e-books, are beginning to be seen in libraries there are still major issues with mainstream publishers not wanting to allow lending of their digital products. Until that is resolved, and even then for some years afterwards, it seems likely that public libraries will be looking to eliminate cost in the provision of books while at the same time trying to make their stock attractive and easily retrievable both in person and online. There may yet be more that can be done to make that stock 'shelf-ready' to meet those demands.

References

1. 'Books' in this article includes all types of stock – CDs, DVDs etc unless specified otherwise.
2. <http://www.nag.org.uk/documents/ServicingGuidelinesBestPracticeforPublicLibraries.pdf>
3. <http://www.bic.org.uk/> At the time of writing serious illness has delayed the publication of the SLC but they will be on the BIC site when available.

Dublin Core will shortly be announcing registration for a seminar at BL on vocabularies and linked data. Speakers will include Barbara Tillett (chair JSC), Pat Riva (Chair FRBR review group), Mirna Willer (Chair ISBD review group), Gordon Dunsire and others.

We had purely selfish motives for attending the CIG Reclassification Event on 20th September 2011 – Robin had begun organising the event while working at the University of Aberdeen and had been asked to give a presentation on it as part of his interview for the Head of Collection Management at the University of Kent. A project to introduce standard classification and shelf ready stock was on our operational plan with Robin as sponsor and Helen as project manager and we were keen to learn how others had achieved this seemingly impossible task.

Slider Puzzle : Reclassification at UEA / Andrew Barker, Head of Library Academic Services, University of East Anglia

The event began with an inspirational talk by Andrew Barker on his experience of reclassification at University of East Anglia (UEA). However, he started by highlighting a challenge central to almost every reclassification project: given that the shelves don't really look any different at the end of the project, how do we justify the disruption and expense involved to library users? Having achieved buy-in to the project through academic boards, Andrew explained the importance of maintaining communications with library users and staff throughout the project.

Having outlined familiar reasons behind the project, Andrew outlined the three-stage approach to reclassification taken at UEA. This really brought home the level of planning needed to make any such project successful. Andrew stressed the importance of choosing the right approach for the organisation, the library and the project. Outsourcing had been the solution chosen by UEA, however Andrew warned that some of the moving companies who tendered for the work did not understand the complexity of the project. He also made clear that a successful project needs a good project manager.

Andrew was the first speaker to mention problems with the supply of labels and by the end of the day we were convinced that this would be the biggest indicator of the likelihood of the success of any project. However, Andrew's presentation did encourage us that such a project could be successfully completed, within a reasonable timescale and with minimal disruption to library users.

Standardising Library of Congress Classification Through Outsourcing / Stuart Hunt, Data Services Manager, University of Warwick

Stuart Hunt's presentation offered hope in a different way – that it is possible to reclassify significant portions of a large collection even if your bid for a project similar to the one undertaken at UEA is turned down. Stuart outlined a portfolio of tools used at the University of Warwick to reduce the scale of the project and focus limited resources where they will have the most impact. Again, he highlighted the need for a good relationship with your data supplier and meticulous planning to ensure the best results.

Stuart explained how it is possible to phase a reclassification project over a number of years and the steps that can be taken to ensure that you don't make the problem any worse. The correct classification can be retained in a record and mined for future reclassification, reducing both the cost and scale of the project. However, Stuart warned that this approach requires considerable preparation to enable you to reclassify sections of the library appropriate to any funding as it becomes available.

Stuart's presentation demonstrated that by breaking any large project such as our own down into smaller discrete projects of differing sizes it is possible to have a significant impact on reclassification within a reasonable period of time using funding from a broad range of sources. This was hugely reassuring at a time when budgets are under pressure and securing resources for big projects is challenging.

Guerrilla Reclassification : Using a Small-scale and Targeted Attack Methodology on Problematic Areas of Classification / Deborah Lee, Senior Cataloguer, Courtauld Institute of Art

Deborah Lee's passion for guerrilla reclassification at the Courtauld Institute of Art was both obvious and infectious.

Everything she has achieved has been without any budget or extra staffing. For Debbie, guerrilla reclassification is characterised by lots of small campaigns, targeting specific areas and informed by what is going to help readers. She stressed the need to constantly gather intelligence about where your current classification is affecting library users' ability to find resources, allowing you to focus on areas where subjects are not collocated. In guerrilla reclassification effective retrieval will always trump theoretical niceties.

Debbie's approach highlighted how much can be achieved outside a formal framework. A few simple rules and basic co-ordination can enable you to make that difference. As long as you continue to think long-term, you can deliver short-term results. Debbie explained that giving enquiry staff the opportunity to identify problem areas and empowering them to do something about them was a great tool for getting them involved in other reclassification work. However, what her presentation highlighted was that just as every guerrilla movement needs a leader, every reclassification project needs a champion. I suspect that by the end of her talk Debbie had persuaded everyone to join the reclassification army.

'The Road Goes Ever On and On': Managing a Reclassification Project / Heather Jardine, Bibliographic Access Manager, City of London Libraries

Heather Jardine's presentation focused on the importance of good project management to the success of reclassification. However, she began by looking at the reasons for reclassification, challenging our thinking that it was mostly about improving efficiency and maximising the benefits of shelf ready services, and highlighting how better classification can and should improve library users' experience and use of the catalogue.

Heather looked at who should be included in the project team, warning against the temptation to use subject experts who perhaps know and care too much about the detail. However, decisions still need to be agreed between the project team and those working with the material. Heather emphasised that it is important to agree on the options, level of specificity and terminology to be used before any reclassification takes place.

Heather also spoke about how practical decisions can help motivate the project team. She suggested starting with the areas where you are getting the most new stock rather than the beginning of the sequence. Similarly, starting with easier areas allows the team to achieve some quick wins and build experience before tackling harder subjects.

Heather began her presentation by saying that she was going to describe an unsuccessful reclassification project but the discussion afterwards demonstrated the relevance of her experience, particularly to those of us working on multiple sites. The efficiencies of a subject- rather than the obvious site-based approach simply hadn't occurred to us.

Using the Tools for Re-classification : OCLC and WebDewey 2.0 / Caroline Kent, Monograph Processing Manager, British Library

The final presentation of the day by Caroline Kent of the British Library looked at some of the tools for reclassification available to libraries using the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC). Those highlighted by Caroline included the relocations and discontinuations spreadsheet available through WebDewey and the OCLC website, the Dewey Blog and the mappings between the DDC and Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) in WebDewey. She also stressed the benefit of any consistent classification as a collection management tool – the British Library is investigating the feasibility of updating all its records to include a current DDC classification to enable greater collection analysis across holdings in multiple languages.

The CIG Reclassification Event exceeded our expectations of the day in that it not only showed us that our project was achievable but highlighted the range of practical approaches, tools and techniques available to us. We were inspired to think big by Andrew, reassured that we would be able to make an impact whatever the outcome of our budget bid by Stuart, recruited to the guerrilla reclassification army by Debbie, prepared for the road ahead by Heather and given some of the tools we need by Caroline. The challenge we've set ourselves is to scope and deliver our own project (*perhaps the subject of a future Catalogue & Index article...*)

Slider Puzzle: Reclassification at the University of East Anglia

Andrew Barker, Head of Academic Services, University of East Anglia

Background

In 2006, the decision was taken to review UEA's acquisition and cataloguing processes as it was felt that a move to shelf ready acquisition increasingly being offered by book suppliers would bring greater value to our community.

Superficially this may seem a straight forward thing to do, but for UEA, like so many other HEIs, we used a homemade version of Library of Congress, not the standard version.

As we wanted to get as much value from shelf ready as we could, including the provision of catalogue records, subject headings and call numbers, we realised that the biggest obstacle to going shelf ready would be our classification scheme. Without doubt, over the years these adaptations had brought value, but over time the schedules had become overly complicated and in addition there was the loss of continuity as staff retired, taking their knowledge of their schemes with them.

In addition, the role of a Faculty Librarian had changed. By 2006 we were in a position of needing a senior librarian to classify a book before it was catalogued. We just didn't have the resources to do this and it was inevitably delaying the time it took to get books on the shelves.

Going Shelf Ready

So the decision was taken to move to shelf ready using a more standard version of Library of Congress, which would, ultimately, involve the reclassification and movement of the whole collection.

The initial challenge of the process was to work with our staff, many of whom had invested years in creating and maintaining the scheme. They were vital to the project as their expertise was crucial to ensuring that we made the right decisions throughout the project. Their commitment was fundamental to the project's ultimate success. It was from the start a partnered approach. Indeed, all the way through the project our success was due to the partnership between staff in the library and all the externals we worked with from students to movers.

One early example of this partnered approach was the decision taken to retain one aspect of the UEA scheme – the local filing suffix for call numbers on our item records. It was felt that this was more appropriate than the traditional, but complex, LC scheme for coding authors, titles and geographic areas. As the project's rationale was to bring additional value to our users, this was a user-led decision. After some modelling against sample records, it was agreed that, with some modifications, we could use this in conjunction with the standard LC scheme. In addition, it would be straightforward enough for our shelf ready suppliers of choice to provide records and labels in this format.

The first stage of the process was to prove the concept of moving to shelf ready acquisition. This enabled us to confirm the benefits and to identify any problems with sourcing records externally. In essence, it was the pilot exercise. So in August 2006, we made the move to shelf ready acquisition using straight LC. The benefits were immediately apparent. Workloads were reduced and books reached the shelves much quicker than with our previous in-house approach.

But of course, the immediate challenge was that we were now running dual sequences within the library, as new books would be in different locations from older books following the in-house scheme. Users did (unsurprisingly!) find this a challenge, as it made browsing more difficult, although we were alert from the start to ensuring users were made aware of the dual sequences and were advised to check other relevant classmarks.

At this point it became clear that without fully reclassifying the collection we would in time have two collections, and as our users often find library collections complicated enough, we realised that we had to grasp that nettle and invest in full standardisation of the whole collection through a single reclassification project. So early in 2007, the project team began the work of initialising the retrospective work of reclassifying the entire library stock to a standard version of LC.

Three Steps to Reclassification

Step 1 The Data Phase

Long before we moved a single book, we had to ensure that we could update our existing bibliographic records. The most difficult part of the process was to ensure that the new records would be an accurate match for the old records. To achieve this we had to find a company with extensive experience of similar sized projects. After a tender process, Backstage Library Works was the successful supplier. We worked with Backstage to agree database sources for the new records, and a methodology for matching. Agreeing an algorithm for automated matching and a process for manually matching records when appropriate took several months, but we knew that taking time now would save us time in the long run.

The initial plan was to import records from external library databases and overlay just the subject fields we needed (for example call numbers and subject headings) with the new data. But it became apparent that for consistency it would be better to take new records for each book. This was because not every record would match exactly in the automated process and that it would be difficult to correct 'mixed' records at a later date.

Following a period of checking records, we received a final file from Backstage that contained new records, including call numbers and subject headings, for the vast majority of the library collection. We then loaded the records in a 'shadow' database of our library catalogue.

Although we did take some corrective action with the new scheme (e.g. where we needed to keep previous sets of books together), we remained disciplined about keeping things standard. It would have been madness, quite frankly, to replace one adapted scheme for another one.

Over Easter 2009 we replaced the existing records on our actual catalogue (Aleph) with the newly edited records from our shadow database and re-indexed. The new records were now visible to our users, but until the books were moved the old call numbers were still displaying, ensuring that our users could still find the books.

Following this we did some work on the new call numbers in order to prepare for replacing the LC Cutters with our own three lettering. In Aleph, there is a bibliographic record for each title which includes a classmark. Attached to each bib record are one or more separate item records. At UEA, we do not display the classmark on each bib record, but instead we display call numbers on the item records to give the precise shelf location. So we worked with Ex Libris to develop a programme to copy the classmark from the 050 field of each bibliographic record into a spare field of the item records. The final part of this program then appended UEA's 3 lettering suffix, taken from the existing call number. Having run the special programme, we manually corrected some of the three lettering suffixes. These new call numbers remained hidden from users until the books were re-labelled and moved. Once we completed this, the data from the spare field was sent back to BSLW to create the new spine labels.

As part of the services we purchased from BSLW, the new records went through authority control and bibliographic enhancement but many records still needed editing manually. These were listed in exceptions reports that identified records where appropriate headings had not been provided as part of the matching process and where the old headings had therefore been retained.

The approach we took was to assess how many of the issues that arose from the authority control process would need to be resolved immediately and how many might be fixed manually over a longer time period. Although these edits were less critical than correcting call numbers, they were still important for maintaining the quality of the catalogue. Going forward, now that we have adopted the LC authority file in place of our local authority file, any newly acquired records will be kept in line as part of regular quarterly updates.

Step 2 Making the Moves

UEA Library has around 850,000 items in the library. Of these, we ended up re-labelling 660,000 and moving 750,000 books. All within a year; so how did we do it?

The biggest challenge was to find the right methodology. Given the economic climate in late 2008, we needed to find an approach that was cost effective, but which didn't impact too heavily on our users. We were advised from some experienced quarters that it would be impossible to achieve without closure of the book stack. We felt that we could find another way through to fit UEA's specific needs.

We knew it would be an enormous challenge to make the moves; it would not be a simple case of moving shelves of books from one location to another. With this project some books would remain in their current locations, some would move across floors, while others would move to different floors.

So, where to start? That's where the slider puzzle title comes in; we needed a gap to start. That gap came from moving official publications down in rolling stack and moving a discrete collection from the floor we planned to start on. That gave us our gap. In addition Backstage had provided pivot tables to indicate which parts of the collection would require the most movement, so we could plan the required swing space to meet the differing needs of different floors by erecting additional shelving.

So although we had by this point a nascent methodology, we were still undecided on how to manage the moves. Should it be UEA led, with a mix of UEA staff and agency staff or should we outsource the work? After discussions it became clear that the challenges of managing this project internally with the recruitment of temporary staff would make it difficult to maintain our core library duties. The decision was therefore taken to go to tender for a company experienced in book moves. We realised that given the nature of the work, it was likely that there would be a significant turnover of staff (as was the case) and that we could not provide the level of motivation required for this type of work.

Although we had interest from a number of companies with book removal experience, it was clear from the tender process that the scope and complexity of the project was unique in the UK. From the tender process we appointed Harrow Green as they shared our vision on both quality and cost.

Before appointing Harrow Green, we had established an outline methodology for this re-shelving phase. This would have separated the processes – books would be re-labelled during the day and re-shelved at night. But once again the benefits of a partnered approach were apparent from the start and in the event Harrow Green and UEA enhanced this initial methodology which combined the stages, but enabled us to keep the stacks open. Indeed the rewarding part of the whole project was that at no stage was any section of the library closed off to our users. Through communication with users by a daily update of sections 'at risk' and with Harrow Green staff assisting with locating books, we reduced disruption to a minimum.

I can't overemphasise the importance of the communication required throughout this project. I met every morning with the Harrow Green project manager and the library's own designated project manager to review the previous day and to preview the forthcoming day. This was essential in ensuring that we were able to minimise any problems that a project of this size was bound to generate. Examples of our discussions included discussions about staff, additional work that was required, and any issues raised by users on the floor. The project would not have been the success it was without this daily briefing.

In July 2009 we received the first batch of labels from Backstage. As part of the methodology each label came in two parts. The replacement spine label with the new call number and a second smaller label containing the core metadata of each item, including its original call number, part of its title, its barcode number plus a 2D version of its barcode which was used for verification during the relabeling process.

The procedure for labelling books was that staff doing the re-labelling were provided with a portable book trolley containing a netbook with a barcode scanner. With the assistance of UEA IT developers, we had created a simple program which matched the 2D barcode on each new label with the book's barcode to verify that the two barcodes matched. This small, but crucial step helped to ensure that staff peeled off the correct spine label and attached it to the correct book. The smaller 2D barcode was then affixed to the inside cover of the book, for quality control sampling. This would also provide a check that a book had been through reclassification and allow for a visual check of its previous call number. After verification the barcode of each item was stored in a textfile; then at three points of the working day, the completed barcode numbers were uploaded from the text file to Aleph. Library staff then ran another program against these items to finally release the new call numbers into the public field. Thus we were able to ensure that users were made aware of a book's new location very soon after it was moved.

Once re-labelled another member of the Harrow Green team would sort the books onto trolleys ahead of re-shelving. Books would then be reshelfed immediately, following the work plans provided by Backstage that indicated where each new sequence would start and finish.

Additional 'temporary shelving' had to be erected to ensure there was space for the new collections near to their new homes. Where books were put onto temporary shelving, the catalogue was updated to make it clear if books were on temporary shelving and spines were given a red dot to alert library staff that these books should be shelved on the 'temporary shelving' shelves.

We had anticipated that this process would last about a year and we were under this target by about three weeks.

Throughout the process we worked with colleagues across the university, advising via the reclassification web pages and emails when areas were about to be moved. Through liaison within the library and outside with the community we ensured that disruption was reduced to a minimum.

Step 3 The Second Data Phase

Between August 2010 and July 2011, we worked again on behind the scenes work with ongoing tasks focussing primarily on fixing out-of-date non-LC subject and other headings not picked up as part of reclassification. We also worked on cleaning up our multi-volume records. Although the high-impact work is now completed, the final clean-up of name and subject headings may take considerably longer.

Conclusion

Ultimately the success of reclassification at UEA can be measured in its lack of impact on our users. However, the more long term success has been, and will continue to be, the value generated in our reduced in-house processes and the reduced costs of using a standard version of the scheme.

Turning NLM into Dewey; re-classification of a nursing collection

Lynne Dyer, Bibliographic Services Team Manager, De Montfort University

Introduction

The CILIP special interest group, CIG, recently held a very interesting [re-classification event](#) that gave practitioners a chance to tell their stories and offer advice and help to others who may have been considering re-classification. CIG also held an [e-forum](#) on the topic; this gave people who were unable to attend the re-classification event an opportunity to contribute to the debate, to share and to learn.

I've previously blogged about how I plan and prepare for a new edition of our classification scheme, so I thought I'd share with you here an account of how we went about re-classifying to DDC, a smallish collection that was classified according to NLM, prior to it being integrated with a larger collection.

I ought to say at this point that I am actually very much in favour of a dedicated classification scheme, especially if it's used for a separate collection housed at a different site from the main library, like our nursing collection was. I was very sorry to lose the specificity of NLM for this collection, although I realised that if it were to merge with the collection in the main library then it would be better all round if the two collections used the same classification scheme.

In some ways we are very lucky to have all our books classified using Dewey and that we have a Dewey sequence that runs from 001-999 spread over only two floors, and with a split (albeit an illogical one!) in the middle of the 610s! It's really only since I've been going on university open days with my daughter that I've come to realise that many academic libraries use a mix of classification schemes and don't have straight runs and while I can quite see the point of having similar subjects shelved together, I can equally appreciate that it's much easier and quicker for shelvees to shelve, and users to find, books when they are in a sequential layout.

The project

The re-classification from NLM to Dewey required a lot of planning. The project had a definite aim, a staffing requirement, a financial requirement, and a defined timescale, and so on. Thus, we had eight categories of considerations:

- i. **project plan** – outline of process – establish scale of project and timescale – establish staffing needs, personnel and training requirements – establish resources and tools requirements – consideration of space requirements of two separate sequences and extra library staff
- ii. **process outline** – re-classify each title – re-spine label each copy and affix identifying label – input new classification number to LMS – shelve into a new Dewey sequence
- iii. **project timescale** – establish the deadline for completion
- iv. **staffing requirements** – establish different categories of staff needed to undertake the variety of tasks – establish cataloguing time based on project deadline and average time taken to cat/class – establish library assistant time based on project deadline, average time taken to re-spine label books and input to LMS and average shelving/shelf moving times – identify personnel (secondment, dedicated temp staff, staff from main site, staff from nursing site)
- v. **staff training** – establish need for face-to-face, printed and post-training support – establish areas for training, e.g. Dewey, strategies for classification, processing, use of LMS
- vi. **physical / virtual resources** – establish needs, e.g. PC, webDewey and password, LMS password, trolleys, pre-printed shelf and trolley markers, training materials, access to permanent cataloguers (for support), spine labelling machine and tape, size charts etc.
- vii. **space requirements** – undisturbed staff working area with access to PCs, the LMS and the internet – physical space to manoeuvre trolleys – sufficient workspace to hold works in hand and training aide-memoirs, space for

spine labelling machine, space to store queries, space/shelving to hold new Dewey sequence

viii **user education** – notices on/around areas under re-classification directing users to the equivalent Dewey area or the enquiry desk, drop-in sessions – one-off planned “training” sessions v availability of Dewey leaflets – encourage in-depth use of the OPAC subject index – explanation of Dewey to be included in all future induction programmes

Some of these categories fell fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Bibliographic Services team (which encompasses cataloguers), others required a degree of liaison with other library teams, while yet others were deemed the responsibility of other library teams. So, for example, the Bibliographic Services team were not responsible for changing the site code of items, nor the boxing up and transportation to the main library, nor the re-shelving of items into the main library collection. It was highlighted from the outset that any work we did would be in close co-operation with the library staff and users at the nursing site to ensure studies were not interrupted nor made unduly difficult, and would provide them with a degree of support during the changeover period, and beyond.

Preparation for the re-cat/class process

We investigated the possibility of using of a ready-made NLM to Dewey [conversion chart](#) but on discovering, for example, that books on the respiratory system classified at WF in NLM could end up at any one of eight different Dewey numbers which would need investigation, we decided it would be just as quick to assign Dewey numbers ourselves, without such help.

An estimate of the cat/class staffing input needed was gleaned from a quick investigation of how long it took to cat/class/process a regular new item, and how many books there were to re-classify. The time of an experienced cataloguing was bought in and library assistants who already worked in the library were paid to do some extra hours to undertake the physical processing of the book stock.

Interrogation of our management information system revealed that there were about 27,000 books with NLM classification numbers, of which about 8,000 were duplicates of items held at the main library, so there were already appropriate class numbers available for these, so it should therefore have been a simple task to change the copy classification number on the LMS and on the actual books without referring to the cataloguer.

The re-cat/class process

During the actual re-class project, we simply started re-classifying from the beginning of the NLM sequence and worked straight through until we reached the end! There were a few smaller collections not included in the main sequence (reference, short loan and media) which we dealt with separately. Returns through the issue were re-classified at point of return. Once an item had been re-classified it was passed to a library assistant to be processed, and then it was shelved in the appropriate place in the new Dewey sequence.

Some of the books we dealt with needed to be re-catalogued: records for some books had been converted for use in our current LMS many years before from a different LMS, and the quality of some of these earlier records did not match our current standards. However, re-classification was the more important task, and re-cataloguing was only done with extremely poor records.

Staff and user training

The cataloguer and the library assistants required little training to undertake their respective roles, apart from to be made aware of each step in the process. Staff and users of the nursing site library, however, needed training in Dewey and how to find books in this scheme that was new to most of them. Library staff also needed to be able to add new items to stock once the library had been converted to Dewey (as they did their own ordering/cat/class/processing), and also to answer enquiries from users, both during the re-class process and once the re-class had been completed.

A cataloguer from the main site library visited the nursing site library on numerous occasions to deliver face-to-face training to the library staff: Several people were on leave at the start of the project, and many of the staff worked very

restricted hours, so numerous visits were needed to catch them all. This training involved discussions ranging from the principles behind Dewey, to where specific topics might now be found. Supporting documentation was produced so that library staff had something to which to refer if they felt unsure.

In order to support the library staff in answering users' enquiries, and to help the users themselves find items, handouts were produced which briefly explained the new scheme and listed many popular topics with both their NLM and Dewey numbers so books on these subjects could easily be found. Also, shelves were labelled with temporary signs that indicated where to look for specific topics and what number sequences were to be found where – and, of course, apologised for the inconvenience!

A spin-off of this training was, of course, that when library staff and students transferred to the main library they were familiar with Dewey, were less daunted by the enormity of the collection, and were more able to find what they required.

Some of the problems

One of the major problems we encountered was appointing sufficient library assistant time to do the physical processing of the books and changing the information on the LMS. At some times of the week we had a couple of library assistants working, but only one spine labelling machine available, which meant that the jobs had to be highly organised. Also, we had decided to attach an identifying sticker to each book spine to avoid nursing site books being accidentally re-shelved in the main library during the year before they were physically moved to the main site, and this took extra time.

The other major issue was moving books around on the shelves. Having set up new shelving for the re-classified books, the dispersal of one NLM number range to any one of up to eight different places in the Dewey sequence meant that we could not predict how much shelving was needed, nor how much of a gap to leave between Dewey numbers, hence, there was a great deal of moving required once the shelves in any Dewey area became full. We also found that because the physical processing was so time-consuming, the cataloguer was collecting books from the shelves themselves, rather than having help with this, although usually an information assistant was able to re-shelve them.

A further element that we had considered, but hadn't realised would be such an issue, was dealing with books that came back through the issue. It was not appropriate to re-shelve these without first re-classifying them, but the number of returns was unpredictable. Often the cataloguer's time was diverted to re-classifying newly returned items rather than continuing with the books on the shelves.

Although the initial interrogation of the management information system had provided us with some numbers, these referred to titles rather than copies, so there were somewhat more books to be processed than catalogued/classified. We had estimated that the re-classification would take longer than the physical processing, but in the event, the cataloguer progressed at a faster rate, whilst the physical processing took somewhat longer than expected. This was mostly due to problems with getting the right staff in the right place at the right time, and because of this it was not possible to identify duplicate items ahead of the cataloguer reaching them, which had been the original plan, and would have saved the cataloguer's time.

The outcome

The re-classification was brought in on time, and therefore on budget, but the processing part took about one month longer than anticipated, although within budget, partly due to lack of staff and partly due to more intricate processes than were anticipated. Subsequent to the completion, the collection was brought to the main library and integrated to form a comprehensive collection, and there have been very few problems and queries over the excellent work done by the temporary re-classification team.

Introduction

Unclassifiable French filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard suggested recently that, as the Greeks had given us *logic*, “if every time we use Aristotle’s ‘therefore’ (as in ‘you don’t love me anymore, therefore...’) we paid £10 to Greece, the [Greek banking] crisis will be over in one day”. (1) The same could be said about *genre*. If we gave £10 each time the word appears online, there would be enough money in the pot to save not only the Greek but all the cuts-threatened libraries in Europe. Aristotle outlined the basics of a genre scheme in *The Poetics* (c. 335 BCE).

Film genres are intrinsically linked to the origins and invention of Cinema even if genre terms as such were not used in the early days. A look at sales catalogues of the time such as the Warwick Trading Co. and the Charles Urban Co. from 1901-1909 show films classified by subjects [See Fig. 1].

126 Cinematography and Bioscope Magazine, March, 1907

.. If it happened the Warwick's got it."

Our Latest Film Subjects

Full Synopsis on pages 135-143.

TOPICAL.			
No. 8089.	South Africans <i>c.</i> Wales. Dec. 1st, 1906. Length 312 feet. Code word "WISON"	£8	11 0
No. 8099.	Hook of Holland Disaster. Length 350 feet. Code word "HAUTO"	£8	15 0
No. 8100.	H.M. the King opening South African Exhibition, and Knighting Sir Pieter Bam. Length 165 feet. Code word "OPAWL"	£4	2 6
No. 8105.	University Boat-race. Length 175 feet. Code word "UTNER."	£4	7 6
GENERAL.			
No. 8092.	Baby Mine and his Toys. Length 205 feet. Code word "BERGS"	£5	2 6
No. 8093.	Hippopotamus Hunt. Length 600 feet. Code word "HENES"	£15	0 0
No. 8094.	Laying Cape to Cairo Railway. Length 495 feet. Code word "CATIC"	£12	7 6
No. 8097.	Through the Land of the Midnight Sun. Length 520 feet. Code word "LOPLY"	£13	0 0
No. 8102.	Norway's Derby. Ski Jumping at Holmenkohn. Length 290 feet. Code word "NETHE."	£7	5 0
No. 8103.	Norwegian Army Manœuvres. Length 525 feet. Code word "ATERR."	£13	2 6

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 138)

THE Warwick Trading Co., Ltd.
The World's Headquarters for Animated Photography,
London: 4 & 5, WARWICK COURT, HOLBORN.
Paris: 16, RUE ST. CECILE

Pirates Beware!
 • Warwick •
 Films are Copyright.

THESE PRICES ARE SUBJECT TO USUAL TRADE DISCOUNT.

Fig. 1

Subject indexes of the period also show that films were still being watched more for their technical ability to record people, places and events than for their artistic merits. So when in 1896 the Lumière Brothers filmed the workers coming out of their factory in Lyon, little did they know that they had created one of the most long-lasting genres of all, the Documentary. Reality TV shows *Big Brother* and *The Only Way is Essex* are just two recent examples of the many contemporary descendants of it. *The Great Train Robbery* (1903), by Edwin S. Porter, is considered the first Gangster and Western movie.

Like any classification schemes, film and television genres are quite divisive: you either find them useful or you don't. Academics became aware of the genre's potential as an object of study in 1948, with Robert Warshow's articles on both the Gangster and the Western movies. (2) We only have to browse the shelves at the BFI Reading Room under 791. 8-83 to realise what a fertile field within film criticism genre is. The film and television industries use genres at all stages of the production cycle: from the writing of the script to the marketing of the film. At the BFI, we use them to offer the public a simple way to explore British screen heritage. But film and television genres have limitations, and detractors too. Their creative value has been perennially dismissed by some as 'derivative, exploitative and manipulative' (3); their usefulness as a classification tool strongly questioned by the content of many films and television programmes, including those of Jean-Luc Godard.

BFI film and television genres (4)

Lack of documentation makes it difficult to establish exactly when the BFI list of genres was first compiled. A quick exercise in Oral History among current and former members of staff (5) suggests that genre terms were added at the beginning of the synopses on the shotlists cards. Then in 1994, to coincide with the publication by the BFI National Archive of the book *A for Andromeda to Zoo Time: the holdings of the National Film and Television Archive, 1936-1979* (6) a definitive list of 103 genre terms was put together [See Fig. 2].

CHAT SHOWS
 CHILDREN'S DRAMA
 CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMES
 CINEMA, TELEVISION AND RADIO
 COMEDY
 CONSUMER PROGRAMMES
 CRAFTS
 CRIME (Fiction)
 CURRENT AFFAIRS
 DANCE
 DAYTIME TELEVISION
 DETECTIVE
 DISCUSSION
 DRAMA
 DRAMA DOCUMENTARIES
 ECONOMICS *see* BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
 EDUCATION (Documentaries)

Fig. 2

There is also an undated document presenting a significantly extended list of 263 terms, which were made available to cataloguers through SIFT (7), an Oracle-based system. However, the genre field could only display 16 characters so the names of compound terms could not be viewed in their entirety. In time this led to confusion. The list was created mainly with the clear aim of improving access to the collection. The document mentioned above states:

"Assigning a genre or genres should allow us to retrieve films in areas which now present difficulties... the published lists of genres which we looked at were all weighted heavily in favour of film and gave little space to television. They had a strong whiff of film buffery too and we found the genres didn't really match the ways in which our researchers ask for information. So we devised our own set of terms...you will probably think that some of our genre terms are not very 'pure' and are more like subject entries. True, but they are practical!" (8)

Another undated document, containing a list of 302 genre terms, also exists. This list was eventually converted into a new database called BID (9) — though unfortunately, the conversion was corrupted and the names of some terms had duplicated. As a result the list had reached 355 terms, and was both repetitive and extremely confusing.

Aims and methodology

The revision project on a final list of 365 terms began in October 2010 and ended in November 2011. The main goals of the project were: to preserve the semantic richness; to avoid confusion and ambiguity; to allow wider use of the list across the BFI without compromising consistency or specificity; to avoid redundancy caused by the use of certain qualifiers; and to clarify the guide notes.

A working group consisting of three members of the curatorial team and one member of the Information Specialists team was established from the start. Each of us represented an specific area: Katy McGahan, 'Non-fiction', Gosta Johansson, 'Television', John Oliver, 'Fiction', and myself, Taxonomy construction and maintenance ⁽¹⁰⁾. We all were in charge of reporting to our respective teams and collecting their feedback. Other curators were also consulted on an ad hoc basis, when the genre term was so specific that only the relevant expert could illuminate us about its meaning. The final decisions taken by the working group were passed on to the Data Standards Group (DSG), chaired by the Head of the Information Department, Gabriele Popp, and the DSG signed off the proposals in December 2011. Implementation of the approved decisions is still ongoing, and so far has rested with the Information Specialists team, but it is likely that curators and other staff members using the terms may get involved in some aspects of the legacy data cleaning in the future.

The working group analysed each term and discussed whether it merited staying on the list according to a set of criteria which included: how much it was used, whether the term was a genre or a subject, and if the term had any meaning. We also looked at whether the genre needed to be renamed, if it could be merged with another term already present on the list, or if upward posting was possible. The working group meetings were long, and discussions sometimes heated: should a Charity appeal programme be indexed with a genre or with a subject? Should Amateur and Home movies be considered one or two genres? Sometimes we were puzzled by the terms themselves: there was a group of some 40 terms all beginning with 'N', as in 'N-Lit', 'N-SocDoc', and N-Sitcom. Gradually consensus on all the terms was achieved and the final draft of the list, which contained 80 terms, was signed off by the DSG.

Main challenges

1- Preserving semantic richness

Describing the content of non-fiction materials using genres can be very challenging. Anything which is not fictional tends to be considered a Documentary. At the BFI, the genre Documentary has been used over 50,000 times. This clearly shows that the usefulness of a term decreases as its use increases. There are, of course, some well-established non-fiction genres such as Travelogues and Actuality films, but in most cases, non-fiction films do not have a genre to call their own. The terminology used by archivists is not always backed up by the 'literary warrant' principle as many aspects of Early Cinema have not yet been researched.

A case in point is the term 'Interest films'. This refers to short films made between 1895 and 1929, that aimed to entertain and amuse, rather than present factual information about the events, people or things being depicted. We did struggle with this one at the BFI, as no proof of its use could be found. FIAF ⁽¹¹⁾ and Library of Congress lists of genres do not include it, and the lack of self-explanatory meaning of the term itself had led to inconsistent use. The films grouped under this term could alternatively be described as Early Documentaries, but this is inaccurate as the term Documentary had not been invented yet. If we added them to the already overcrowded Documentary pool, they would have got lost among the other 50,000 films and television programmes and searching for them would have become a more time-consuming task. It was clear that the term 'Documentary' was repressing the as yet unstudied area of classification systems used during the Early Cinema period, and was also impoverishing our vocabularies. In the end, we decided that the term had to stay, and luckily, soon enough, BFI's Silent Film expert Bryony Dixon came across a document at the British Board of Film Classification where the films being submitted for rating were referred to as 'Interest films'.

2-Eliminating redundancy

As mentioned earlier, when we started the revision project the list contained 365 terms and had a flat structure. It differentiated between fiction and non-fiction by repeating the term with a qualifier as in 'Media' and 'Media films' or 'Music' and 'Music films'. The scope notes clarified their use. Thus 'Media' was to be applied to 'Non-fiction films or television programmes focusing on the media and newspaper industry' and 'Media films' was for 'Fiction films and television programmes set in, or focusing on, the media (cinema, television and radio) and newspaper industry'. However, that information, (i.e. whether a film/tv programme was fiction or non-fiction) was already present somewhere else in the record. The problem was that the old Oracle-based systems did not allow for searching using this particular field so the list of genres, which did include that differentiation, made up for the database's drawbacks. CID, ⁽¹²⁾ the BFI's new integrated database, allows for searching across all fields, which in turn makes it possible to eliminate the unnecessary reiteration of bits of key data on the genre list. This has led to a significant reduction in the number of terms.

3-Avoiding confusion

A genre list helps to describe what a moving image 'is' whilst a subject describes what the content of a film or television programme is 'about'. *Alien* (1979) is a Science-fiction and Horror film; *Alien Encounters of the Screen Kind* (1998) is a Documentary about how Hollywood has dealt with Science-fiction over the years.

However, as explained in the earlier quote, subjects at the BFI had been mixed with genres to facilitate retrieval, at a time when the database's searching capabilities were not sophisticated enough. To make things more confusing, UDC-based subject headings are also used to index the content of moving image materials. The card index containing these subjects became an in-house, Oracle-based thesaurus around 2004, but not all relevant staff had access to it. This meant that until the introduction of CID in 2011, the genre list was being used via one system by two departments (curators and data editors) and the thesaurus via another system by the curatorial team. Faced with unequal access to the systems and alternative ways of adding terms, staff could only do what was practical but not ideal. The genre list became a short cut to subject index content. For instance, the terms 'Agriculture' and 'Architecture' existed on both the genre list and the UDC-based thesaurus. By the end of the revision project some 70 terms were ring-fenced to be removed. When the term is an exact match to another in the thesaurus, as in the cases above, the task of tidying up is easy enough. When there is not an exact match, the process of re-classification requires a careful analysis of the actual titles. This is done manually so can be extremely time-consuming.

4-Promoting consistency

Several printed versions of a document containing scope notes did exist but the versions were not identical and neither were they always available to all the BFI staff who added genre terms on a daily basis. It therefore depended on the document in hand whether one could discover about the different meanings of Avant-garde, Experimental, Surrealist and Underground or not. Guidelines about how to assign a genre or how to propose or create a new one were not present in all versions either. Each department had their own ways of doing this so the list of genres grew in an unsystematic and uncontrolled manner. Faced with this lack of homogeneity, it is to the credit of the BFI staff using the genre terms that the list did not get longer or the level of inconsistency any bigger. The process of re-writing the genre standards is now well under way, and we are using the same approach: relevant members of staff agree upon definitions which are then passed on to the Data Standards Group for final approval. The definitions are then added to the new collections management system which makes them accessible at the point of indexing. They are also available to the wider BFI via the Information Specialists' pages on the Intranet.

5-Dealing with legacy data

The massive task of re-classifying and dealing with the legacy data is still ongoing. We have identified six different types of tasks:

- De-duplication: duplication was caused by the transfer of the genres from one system to another. For instance, 'Home Movies Vid' and 'Home Movies Vide' will be replaced with 'Home Movies'. Once that job is done we can delete the two original terms.

- Deletion of meaningless genres: this includes mainly the infamous 'N-s'. This task will be easy as the terms are linked to very few records.
- Merge with: the need for merger comes mainly from the use of a qualifier to signify 'fiction' or 'non-fiction'. Examples include: 'Animals' and 'Animal films', 'Biographies' and 'Biopics', 'Architectural' and 'Architecture'.
- Match of genres and subjects: as mentioned earlier in some instances this has been easy (i.e. matching genre Animals with subject Animals). There are, however, much trickier cases. For example, the genre 'Food and Drink' has been used for both 'Cookery programmes' and 'Documentaries' about famines, whisky production, etc.
- Rename: we have updated some names to make them more current. Examples include: 'Hidden camera', and 'Artists Moving Image' which substitute 'Candid Camera' and 'Avant-garde' respectively.
- Re-classification: when a genre is deemed obsolete (e.g. 'Day time Television', 'City symphonies') the titles previously attached to them have to be manually re-classified.
- Adding new genres to empty records: in the process of analysing the list of genres it has become apparent that there are over 11,000 records with the Genre field empty.

Conclusions

The genre revision project has demonstrated that the creation of taxonomies to facilitate access to the collections is a collaborative effort between the staff using the terms and information professionals. The project has shown the importance of taxonomy maintenance and the need for a dedicated team to do so. It has also revealed the need for further work to enrich the terminology used to describe Non-fiction collections, and the addition of a Phase 2 to the project was agreed, and has already started. We are currently looking at expanding the categories related to Sponsored films.

At the BFI, the description of the content of films and television programmes has been established as a minimum cataloguing requirement so projects like the genre revision are now getting the attention and resources they deserve. We currently have another three active lists of genres across the Institute: the Stills team, the Library, and Screenonline all use their own list of terms. The plan is to consolidate all the lists into one single taxonomy. The task ahead is huge, but technically feasible. Like any other classification system, a fit genre taxonomy can be put to work to produce knowledge around collections so they can be easily explored.

References

1. Jean-Luc Goddard: 'Film is over: what to do?', by Fiachra Gibbons, *The Guardian*, 12/07/2011.
2. Warshow, Robert (1948) 'The Gangster as Tragic Hero' in Warshow, Robert *The Immediate experience: movies, comics, theatre and other aspects of popular culture*, (1962), New York : Doubleday.
3. Christine Lagan, 'For the magic of the money', *The Guardian*, p.46, 14/02/2012.
4. The BFI's definition of genre accommodates television formats (e.g. Talk shows) and types of films and television programmes (e.g. Adverts, Amateur and Home Movies).
5. I would like to thank BFI Information Specialist Natasha Fairbairn and ex-BFI Non-Fiction curator Simon Baker for their help with piecing together this brief history of the BFI's genres.
6. Baker, Simon and Terris, Olwen (Eds.), (1994), *A for Andromeda to Zoo Time: The TV holdings of the National Film and Television Archive, 1936-1979*, London: BFI.
7. "Summary of Information on Film and Television".
8. Undated BFI document sent to film archives around the world through FIAF (International Federation of Film Archives).
9. "BFI Integrated database".
10. At the BFI we use Taxonomy as a loose and broad term covering all different types of vocabularies, including lists of genres, traditional classifications schemes, in-house thesauri and lists of subject headings.
11. "International Federation of Film Archives".
12. "Collections Information Database".

Guerrilla reclassification: a call to arms

Deborah Lee, Senior Cataloguer, Courtauld Institute of Art ⁽¹⁾

Reclassification projects customarily involve reordering entire libraries, usually changing from one scheme or version of a scheme to another. ⁽²⁾ However, for various reasons, the large-scale approach traditionally associated with adopting a new classification scheme will not necessarily be the most appropriate solution for every classification problem. For example, there might not be a pre-existing classification scheme that would considerably improve retrieval in a particular library. In addition, staff or funds may not be available for a long, formal project; in these times of financial hardship, reclassification will have to fight with more urgent topics to gain the attention of library directors. Therefore, this article is going to consider an informal and less costly way to tackle classification issues, using a method of reclassification outside the large-scale reclassification project structure: for the purposes of this article this method will be termed “guerrilla reclassification”. The discussion will draw upon a particular case study institution, the Courtauld Institute of Art book library, where this method was developed. In short, the battle against the most awkward and inconsistent areas of our classification schemes is still on, only the battle is moving underground.

The article starts with a brief overview of the issues relating to the Courtauld classification scheme, outlining the problems which have given rise to the need for reclassification in this library. Next, guerrilla reclassification will be defined, and placed within the context of other reclassification approaches. This will be followed by an outline of five “rules of engagement”, which are the ideas underpinning the guerrilla reclassification approach. Each “rule of engagement” will be illustrated using examples at the Courtauld including a mini-project to reclassify the Asia exhibition catalogues. Though guerrilla reclassification was developed for use at the Courtauld, it is hoped that this method will be a useful addition to any library’s reclassification firepower.

The Courtauld classification scheme’s focus is the subject which is taught and researched at the Courtauld: history of art. ⁽³⁾ The scheme has been used by the library since the Courtauld’s opening in 1932, and is an adapted version of the third edition of the Library of Congress Classification fine art schedules which were published in 1922. Little work has been carried out on the scheme since its creation, other than occasional new classmarks; in other words, the structure and most of the contents are frequently out of date. ⁽⁴⁾ The history and an outline of the structure of the Courtauld classification scheme are described in a recent article in the *Art Libraries Journal* (Lee, 2011). One of the most significant issues relates to transcription: when the scheme was transcribed from one format to another, the typographic information which indicated hierarchies and that placed generic words such as “other” in their context was lost. These transcription errors have led to problems with collocating materials on the shelves. In summary, there is a significant need for reclassification at the Courtauld.

However, when the particular circumstances of the Courtauld classification scheme were considered, it became clear that a “traditional” reclassification project might not be appropriate. Lack of resources, including funding, severely limited the scale of any potential project; it was also unclear whether adopting a new scheme would have enough benefits to outweigh the costs. Other ideas were considered, and it seemed that we could solve at least some of the problems by targeting specific areas of the classification scheme. Therefore, a small-scale and targeted reclassification method was developed, termed “guerrilla reclassification” for the purposes of this article.

“Guerrilla reclassification” is a method where classification problems are tackled via a series of small, mini-projects. While the overall reclassification project might be open-ended, the focus of the reclassification work is on small-scale and targeted projects. This reclassification method is concerned with incrementally improving the classification in a library, one problem and one area at a time. This is in direct opposition to a “new-scheme” and/or large-scale “classification revolution” approach. Using resources already in the library – such as existing staff – is at the centre of guerrilla reclassification, and the projects chosen will have user retrieval at their heart. Though this is an informal approach rather than a codified methodology, it is useful to think about methodological issues such as the process for selecting the most appropriate areas to target, how to keep track of classification issues and the formulation of project strategies. Therefore, five “rules of engagement” are now described and these rules will be put into context via examples from the Courtauld.

Rule 1. Constantly gather intelligence

Constantly gathering information on classification problems was found to be very beneficial at the Courtauld. All year round, classification issues are documented when they are discovered, and recorded on a spreadsheet. Therefore, when an opportunity arises to plan and carry out a small classification project, ideas about problematic areas of the scheme have already been collated. For example, difficulties with the classification of Asia exhibition catalogues had been identified on the classification spreadsheet by a staff member as a particularly problematic area of our stock in August 2009; consequently, when discussing potential summer projects nearly a year later, the spreadsheet reminded us of this particularly troublesome area. The Courtauld's experiences have shown that extracting "intelligence" about areas of the shelves with particularly problematic classmarks from colleagues who are involved primarily with shelving or desk work is particularly useful, as is noting any areas of the scheme that readers find especially difficult. Gathering data in this way ensures that our reclassification efforts will be focused on projects that make a practical difference.

Rule 2. Pick your battles carefully

It is probable that there will be more classification battles to fight in a library than resources and time available to fight them. At the Courtauld we have decided to select our reclassification projects using two main criteria, which are often but not always interlinked. First, we seek to expend our efforts where classification issues cause materials on the same subject to be distributed across different parts of the library. Second, we prioritise areas that will deteriorate rapidly if we do not fix them. Guerrilla classification puts effective retrieval over theoretical niceties, and an example of this in action follows.

The Courtauld classifies its exhibition catalogues by exhibition venue, and had significant problems with the classification of catalogues from Asia. Originally, there was only one classmark in use for Asian catalogues, but at some point, separate classmarks were created for China, Israel and Japan. However, though the scheme was expanded to include these new classmarks, the items on the shelf were not reclassified; for instance, the classmark Z5085 could mean any country in Asia if it was an older catalogue, or a catalogue from Japan if it was newer. This created significant problems with collocation, as old and new catalogues from the same exhibition venue would be housed under different classmarks. Worse still, new catalogues are received regularly for venues in these countries, so the order of this section would only deteriorate as time went by.

In contrast, we have had complaints about the classification of a particular artist, Pablo Picasso. The Courtauld classification scheme is structured around artists having a fixed nationality – however problematic assigning a country may prove for certain artists. From an art history perspective, classing Picasso as a French artist troubled some of our staff who believed he should sit with Spanish artists. ⁽⁵⁾ Though it would be ideal to explore this issue further, at the moment all the items about Picasso are collocated on the shelves under "French" and this will continue for the foreseeable future. Weighing up the Asian exhibition catalogue issue and the Picasso nationality issue using the two criteria mentioned above produced a straightforward verdict on which potential project was a priority: the reclassification battle of Asian exhibition catalogues was planned, fought and won.

Rule 3. Compare the scheme with the shelf before reclassifying

The third rule of engagement suggests that before considering changing the classification scheme, it is worth checking whether your classification scheme matches what is actually on the shelves and vice versa. For example, classification projects at the Courtauld always include a stage for checking the scheme against the shelves – we do not assume that the classmarks of items on the shelves necessarily match the scheme. In some cases, the classification scheme is incorrect: we have a number of cases where transcription problems have caused errors in the scheme, but the shelves have maintained their correct classification – for example, the classmark for Italian landscape architecture was erroneously omitted from the classification scheme when the scheme was converted from book format to a computer file. In other cases, the scheme was updated at some point in the past, but not all the items on the shelves were reclassified accordingly. An example of this is our collection of Asia exhibition catalogues which is described above.

Rule 4. Think long-term, act short-term

Guerrilla reclassification requires long-term thinking even when working on short-term and small-scale reclassification projects. The Courtauld has an unfortunate history of adding new classmarks wherever there is a gap in the schedules without consequence for the scheme's structure, and this has caused many problems – for instance, the hierarchies in the performance art section have broken down through the unstructured addition of new subjects in this section.

However, examples of thinking in a long-term manner can also be seen at the Courtauld. For example, when working on the Asia exhibition catalogue reclassification project, it was decided that while we were reclassifying this section we would consider whether adding new countries to the scheme would be helpful. There was space in the schedules to add one more country (without resorting to decimals) and it was decided to add a new classmark for "India". The rationale was straight forward: the growing interest in Asian art at the Courtauld as part of its new strategic direction and research expertise in Indian art of key staff members is likely to yield a number of exhibition catalogues from this region in the future.

Another example concerns exhibition history. In 2011, the Courtauld received a number of new items on the subject of exhibition history, and this subject had no home in our scheme on a structural level. Therefore, we considered the likely trajectory of new collections in this area and edited the classification scheme accordingly; our adopted solution was to model our new classmarks from recent editions of the Library of Congress Classification, with the idea of shadowing their treatment of this growing sub-discipline both now and as the subject evolves in the future.

Rule 5. Persuade everyone to join the reclassification army

The final rule concerns "sharing the reclassification love"; or, in other words, persuading as many staff as possible to take part in reclassification efforts. At the Courtauld this has proved successful in a number of ways. Using non-cataloguing staff in addition to cataloguing staff has enabled us to finish projects very quickly; for instance, the Asia exhibition catalogue project was finished within a month. The systems and services librarian and the senior cataloguer planned this project together. For implementation, the systems and services librarian changed the classmarks on the system, the senior cataloguer assigned the classmark for each venue and resolved classification problems and the student assistants did the bulk of the relabelling work and moving items around. If cataloguing staff are only used for the activities which need specialist classification or cataloguing skills, this frees up cataloguers to tackle other cataloguing or classification projects. Involving non-cataloguing staff instigates buy-in for guerrilla reclassification activities; it becomes more than "just" a cataloguers' project. Hence the Asia exhibition catalogue reclassification project was not a cataloguing project: it was a library project.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the guerrilla reclassification approach is about home-grown, small-scale and targeted projects, which improve the classification of a library over a long timeframe. This approach involves problem solving and tidying small areas of the library using any available pocket of time. There are five principles that guide the guerrilla reclassification approach: asking all colleagues to think about areas which need reclassification, selecting the areas you target carefully, thinking about shelf and scheme alignment before considering updating the scheme, thinking about future needs, and utilising all library staff to help. This method is particularly useful to sort out significant classification issues when the time and resources are not available for a major reclassification project. Therefore, it is recommended that when considering going to war against classification problems in your library, you consider starting a guerrilla reclassification campaign of your own.

References

1. This article is based on a presentation given as part of an event on reclassification organised by the CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group on 20th September 2011. The author would like to thank Derek Lee for his guidance and Antony Hopkins for his support in writing this article.
2. For example, in Steele and Foot's (2010) study of the reclassification activities of Association and Research Libraries (ARL) members, the only type of reclassification mentioned is reclassifying a library from one scheme to another; for example, question four of the survey suggests that reclassification is from Dewey Decimal Classification to Library of Congress Classification or is else "other", and both responses of "other" still involved reclassifying from one scheme to another.
3. The Courtauld classification scheme is unpublished. The current format of the scheme – a Word file which is printed out and annotated by cataloguers – was created in 2008 and the file has occasional minor amendments (Courtauld Institute of Art, 2008-).
4. Naturally, classification schemes evolve over time. Tennis (2010, p.225) differentiates between "versions" and "states" of classification schemes, where the former involve major changes to the scheme and the latter less substantial variations. Using this terminology, we could conceive that the copy of the Courtauld classification scheme in current use is only a new "state" of the scheme first devised in 1932, rather than a more radical new "version". However, Tennis' model (2010, p.225) is also temporal, where new "states" of a scheme appear at shorter intervals than the more extensively-updated "versions". The continued use of the first and only "version" of the Courtauld classification scheme is thus further evidence of how far the scheme is outdated; in eighty years we would expect at least one new "version" of the scheme, rather than merely the occasional new "state".
5. Picasso can be considered a Spanish or French artist – or a combination of both – depending on your definition of the nationality of an artist. For example, the Grove Art Online entry for Picasso (McQuillan, 2008) describes Picasso as a Spanish artist, but one who was "active" in France.

Bibliography

Courtauld Institute of Art, 2008- . Courtauld classification scheme [Word document]. Unpublished.

Lee, D., 2011. "Dealing with adaptation: the Courtauld classification scheme", *Art libraries journal*, 36 (4), pp.26-33.

McQuillan, M., 2008. "Picasso, Pablo", *Grove Art Online* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/grove/art/T067316> [accessed February 29, 2012]

Steele, T.D. & Bales Foote, J., 2010. "Reclassification in academic research libraries: is it still relevant in an e-book world?", *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 49 (1), pp.14-32

Tennis, T., 2010. "Measured time: imposing a temporal metric to classificatory structures", in Gnoli, C. & Mazzocchi, F. (eds.) *Paradigms and conceptual systems in knowledge organization: proceedings of the eleventh international ISKO conference, 23-26 February 2010, Rome, Italy*. Würzburg: Ergon [Online]. Available at: http://www.ergon-verlag.de/isko_ko/ [accessed January 16, 2012]

New international thesaurus standard published

Stella Dextre Clarke

ISO 25964-1 is the new international standard for thesauri, replacing ISO 2788 and ISO 5964. The full title is **Information and documentation - Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies - Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval**. As well as covering monolingual and multilingual thesauri, it addresses twenty-first century needs for data sharing, networking and interoperability. Content includes:

- construction of mono- and multi-lingual thesauri;
- clarification of the distinction between terms and concepts, and their inter-relationships;
- guidance on facet analysis and layout;
- guidance on the use of thesauri in computerized and networked systems;
- best practice for the management and maintenance of thesaurus development;
- guidelines for thesaurus management software;
- a data model for monolingual and multilingual thesauri;
- brief recommendations for exchange formats and protocols.

An XML schema for data exchange has been derived from the data model, and is available free of charge at <http://www.niso.org/schemas/iso25964/>.

In the UK you can purchase a copy of Part 1 from BSI (telephone 020 8996 7555; website <http://shop.bsigroup.com/en/> , search for “ISO 25964”) where it is known as BS ISO 25964-1, and it replaces BS 8723 Parts 2 and 5. If you live overseas, get it from the national standards body in your country e.g. AFNOR, NISO or DIN. Alternatively you can order one directly from ISO in Switzerland at <http://www.iso.org/iso/store.htm>. You can also view the standard at some UK reference libraries; there is a list at <http://www.bsieducation.org/Education/resources/libraries.shtml> .

Interoperability with other vocabularies is to be the title of Part 2 of the international standard **ISO 25964 Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies**.

Content of the draft

ISO DIS 25964-2, as the draft of Part 2 is known, provides guidance for the context in which diverse vocabularies are used and needed to access multiple information systems. It deals first with structural models for mapping across vocabularies, such as hub structures or direct linkage. It goes on to set out good practice for mapping between one vocabulary and another, including:

- the various types of mapping recommended (e.g. equivalence, broader/narrower, etc.);
- how to handle pre-coordination of concepts;
- techniques for identifying candidate mappings;
- data management and exchange;
- display of mapped vocabularies.

The guidance in this standard applies not just to mapping between one thesaurus and another, but also to interoperability between thesauri and classification schemes, taxonomies, subject heading schemes, ontologies, terminologies, name authority lists and synonym rings. Key characteristics including the basic semantic components of each of these vocabulary types are described, and where applicable examples are given of mapping between these and thesauri.

Public availability

The draft is now available for public consultation until the end of April 2012, free of charge, at <http://drafts.bsigroup.com/> . You can find it there easily by entering “25964” in the search box. Although no payment is required you will need to

register before viewing the whole document, section by section.

You are invited to enter as many comments as you wish, and propose alternative text if appropriate. All comments submitted online will be forwarded to the drafting committee (ISO TC46/SC9/WG8) at the end of the commenting period. Comments are welcome from prospective users of all nationalities.

Project Organization

Development of the standard is managed by a Working Group known as ISO TC46/SC9/WG8, which has participants from 17 countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, New Zealand, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, UK, Ukraine, and USA. The Group is chaired by Stella Dextre Clarke of the UK, and its Secretariat is provided by NISO (USA). Active members include: Sylvie Dalbin (FR), Johan De Smedt (BE), F. Javier García Marco (ES), Michèle Hudon (CA), Daniel Kless (DE), Traugott Koch (DE), Richard Light (GB), Jutta Lindenthal (DE), Marianne Lykke (DK), Esther Scheven (DE), Douglas Tudhope (GB), Leonard Will (GB) and Marcia Zeng (US). For more information, see <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/iso25964>

Published articles and conference proceedings

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. ISO 25964: a standard in support of KOS interoperability. Gilchrist, Alan and Vernau, Judi, Editors. Facets of Knowledge Organization; 2011 Jul 4-2011 Jul 5; London. London: Emerald; 2012. Also available at: <http://www.iskouk.org/conf2011/papers/dextreclarke.pdf>, together with audio recording and presentation slides.

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. In Pursuit of Interoperability: Can We Standardize Mapping Types? *In*: Boteram, F, Goedert, W, Hubrich, J (Eds), Concepts in Context – Cologne Conference on Interoperability and Semantics in Knowledge Organization; 2010 Jul 19-2010 Jul 20; Cologne, Germany. Ergon Verlag 2011. Presentation available at: http://linux2.fbi.fh-koeln.de/cisko2010/presentationen/2010-07-20_dextre_clarke.ppt.

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. ISO 2788 + ISO 5964 + Much Energy = ISO 25964. ASIS&T Bulletin . 2008 Oct-2008 Nov 30; 35 (1). Available at: http://www.asis.org/Bulletin/Oct-08/OctNov08_DextreClarke.html

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. Thesaurus standards on a converging track. Legal Information Management. 2010; 10(1):43-45.

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. Evolution towards ISO 25964: an international standard with guidelines for thesauri and other types of controlled vocabulary. Information Wissenschaft & Praxis. 2007 Nov-2007 Dec 31; 58(8):441-444.

Presentations

Dextre Clarke, Stella G. Types of mapping recommended in ISO 25964, and the question of reciprocity [Presentation]. 2010 Sep 9. Available at: <http://www.comp.glam.ac.uk/pages/research/hypermedia/nkos/nkos2010/presentations/dextreclarke.pdf>

Hudon, Michèle. ISO 25964 : vers une nouvelle norme pour l'organisation et l'accès à l'information et aux connaissances [in publication, Hermès-Sciences. Meantime see: <http://conferences.isko-france.asso.fr/fr/abstracts/sa1a.htm>].

Lindenthal, Jutta and Scheven, Esther. ISO 25964 - Standard der Information und Dokumentation: "Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies" [Presentation]. 2009. Available at: http://isko.gesis.org/d-a-ch/bonn2009/Lindenthal_Scheven-Isko-bonn-2009-ISO25964.pdf.

Rabault, Hélène and Zysman, Hélène. Les schémas de concepts et le Web sémantique : la norme sur les thésaurus ISO 25964. In Journée Afnor/Bnf "Référentiels et données d'autorité à l'heure du Web sémantique", 2011 May 27 Available at: http://www.bnf.fr/documents/afnor2011_norme_thesaurus.pdf

Book review

Essential Library of Congress Subject Headings

Vanda Broughton. Facet, 2011. 192 p. 9781856046183

Reviewed by Claire Sewell, University of Cambridge

Following on very much in the same vein as its predecessors, this latest in a series designed to explain cataloguing basics aims to be something of a teach-yourself guide to subject headings.

The book starts with several chapters of theoretical background including the history of LCSH, the reasons behind its layout and an introduction to the principles of indexing. The chapter on content analysis is particularly interesting. It explains the process of descriptive cataloguing very well and concentrates on how it should be seen from the point of view of the end user. This is often missing from similar books - there's plenty of information about *how* to apply subject headings without going into the *why*, which is just as important as the mechanics of the process.

Later chapters cover the mechanics of how to construct headings. They move from basic single subject headings through to more complex headings which combine subdivisions. Also included are chapters on topical, geographic and free-floating subdivisions. The book is designed for the novice cataloguer to read cover to cover but I found it easy enough to dip in and out to sections of particular interest. Each chapter is laid out in a simple, easy to understand format with summaries of the main points and plenty of exercises for practice. Multiple real life examples from the Library of Congress catalogue are used to illustrate the text. These are well chosen, humorous and make what could have been a dry text a pleasure to read.

The last few chapters cover headings for literature, the arts and music. These would obviously be of particular use for those who work in libraries specialising in these materials. The final chapters cover Classification Web LCSH in the online world which explains how to use the various online materials provided by the Library of Congress. There is also an extensive bibliography which would be useful to any students researching the area.

The book reads very much like a course textbook but given that it's aimed at beginners this is to be expected. I would recommend this book to both new cataloguers and lone librarians who find themselves cataloguing with no formal training. I would also recommend it to anyone who feels that they could do with a fresh and fun reminder of the basics of subject headings.



Catalogue & Index is electronically published by the Cataloguing and Indexing Group of the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) (Charity No. 313014)

Subscription rates: free to members of CIG; GBP 15.00 for non-members & institutions

Advertising rates: GBP 70.00 full-page; GBP 40.00 half-page. Prices quoted without VAT.

Submissions: In the first instance, please contact the Editor:

For book reviews, please contact the Book Reviews Editor: Neil T. Nicholson, Cataloguing & Metadata Services Team Leader, National Library of Scotland, e: n.nicholson@nls.uk

ISSN 0008-7629

CIG website: <http://www.cilip.org.uk/specialinterestgroups/bysubject/cataloguingindexing>

CIG blog: <http://communities.cilip.org.uk/blogs/catalogueandindex/default.aspx>

Tags from the CIG blog on specific areas of interest:

**[authority control](#) [book reviews](#) [Catalogue and Index](#) [cataloguing](#) [CIG activities](#)
[CIGS](#) [classification](#) [committees and working groups](#) [conferences](#)
[Dewey digitised material](#) [Dublin Core](#) [events](#) [folksonomies](#) [linkblog](#) [MARC](#)
[metadata](#) [news](#) [RDA](#) [Semantic Web](#) [social software](#)
[standards](#) [taxonomies](#) [UDC](#)**