

7-2014

Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Cornell Law Library, jkm95@cornell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/libpub>



Part of the [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Magagnosc, Jacqueline, "Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars" (2014). *Cornell Law Librarians' Publications*. Paper 6.
<http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/libpub/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Cornell Law: A Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cornell Law Librarians' Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Cornell Law: A Digital Repository. For more information, please contact jmp8@cornell.edu.

SERIALS SPOKEN HERE
Kurt Blythe, Column Editor

Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Jacqueline Magagnosc, Contributor

This quarter's column features a report on select sessions of the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Meeting, held January 24–28, 2014, in Philadelphia, PA.

ALA MIDWINTER

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Continuations Management Librarian
Cornell Law Library
Ithaca, New York
E-mail: jkm95@cornell.edu

ALA Midwinter 2014 Continuing Resources Standards Forum: NISO Standards Update

Nettie Legace, associate director for programs, National Information Standards Organization (NISO), provided brief updates about three NISO projects.

Legace explained that since the publication of the PIE-J (Presentation and Identification of E-Journals, <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/piej>) recommended practice for presentation and identification of e-journals in March 2013, the PIE-J working group has been reformed as a standing committee. The goal of PIE-J is to help publishers provide accurate and uniform listing of titles on their websites. Journal title changes and publisher creativity can make it difficult to locate content; PIE-J recommended practice provides clear, illustrative examples of how publishers should organize journal titles on their websites, including earlier titles and citations with historically accurate ISSN sequences and dates.

Legace continued her presentation with an update about the KBART (Knowledge Base and Related Tools, <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/kbart>) initiative. KBART focuses on link-resolver database accuracy. Phase one rec-

ommendations consist of a basic data format for exchange of data published to content providers. Several dozen providers are currently compliant. Further recommendations in the area of open access materials, monographs, and conference proceedings are expected in phase two. A consortial draft was available for comment during the fall of 2013. Legace anticipates document approval and distribution by February 2014.

ODI (Open Discovery Initiative; <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/>) was the subject of the final part of Legace's presentation. The ODI working group is focused on the new generation of discovery services: what breadth and level of content, usage statistics, and streamlining of processes will be most useful as vendors work with content providers. The constituencies represented include vendors, discovery services, and libraries (which include end users by proxy). A draft recommended practice was available for comment through last fall. Legace anticipates document approval and distribution by February 2014.

Predatory Publishers

Rick Anderson, associate dean for scholarly resources and collections, University of Utah, and Regina Romano Reynolds, director, United States ISSN Center and head of the ISSN Section, Library of Congress, spoke about efforts to address predatory open access publishers and their impact on the international and United States ISSN centers.

Rick Anderson discussed Beall's List, a list of predatory publishers maintained at <http://www.scholarlyoa.com>. According to Anderson, the specific criteria for inclusion on this list seem to boil down to two categories. The first category can be labeled misrepresentation to the world, as evidenced by misleading journal titles that are similar to or mimic the sound of established journals or the hijacking of existing journal titles. Additionally, the publisher might list

Address correspondence to Kurt Blythe, Serials Access Librarian, Davis Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.
E-mail: kblythe@email.unc.edu

a fictitious editorial board made up of appropriated names or claim fictitious headquarters. Publishers might impose author fees without warning ahead of time (invoice after publication, similar to directory scams) or republish articles from existing journals without permission. The second category is the problem of selling authors false prestige. A predatory publisher will claim peer review and editing that does not exist, make false claims of index coverage and impact factors, or send “spammy” invitations appealing to the author’s vanity. This issue deceives both readers and authors and has real-world consequences.

In answer to the question about why Beall’s List has been so controversial, Anderson stated that some objections come from the publishers characterized as predatory. Such publishers do not want to be exposed since they will lose the ability to attract authors. Additionally, a disproportionate number of publications from the Middle East and Asia are characterized as predatory. This might be explained by the explosion of research activity in Asia, with many authors needing publication. Tenure in Asia can be less flexible than in other geographic areas. Candidates may be required to have certain numbers of publications in titles of a certain impact factor, which can create an environment where this kind of scam can more easily be run. However, there is also an issue of cultural bias. The other source of objection is from the open access community. Criticism of predatory open access publishers can be construed as criticism of all open access publishing.

According to Anderson, the importance of Beall’s List lies in the fact that Jeffrey Beall is unmasking unethical companies that prey on authors. These companies are in the business of making money by lying. They engage in scholarly intellectual theft. The problem is that Beall does not provide details on why a publisher is selected for the list, and the process for removal is managed only by Beall, leading to a lack of transparency. Additionally, Beall has given evidence that he might have an agenda against open access. Predatory open access publishing is a growing problem. Anderson hopes that Beall’s List will continue to serve its function and be improved, including refining the process of adding and subtracting publishers and becoming more rigorous.

An audience member commented that scammers are mimicking emails from legitimate publications. The DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) is developing criteria to identify predatory publishers; perhaps DOAJ may be a good home for Beall’s List. There also needs to be a mechanism for publishers who are acting in good faith but are inexperienced or incompetent to challenge inclusion in the list. There are many gray areas, but the list is binary. Ultimately, the community needs to address how we can provide rigor and scale.

An audience member asked, “Do we know anything about whether faculty organizations are having a conversation about predatory publishing?” Anderson responded that we are not really having such a conversation, but as librarians we do need to get the word out. However, a conver-

sation about predatory publishing is difficult to have while simultaneously promoting OA publishing with faculty. It is a delicate and complex situation.

Regina Romano Reynolds discussed the impacts of predatory open access publishers on the ISSN network. She stressed the role of academic libraries, professional organizations, and the industry as better places than the ISSN network for management of this issue. At its essence, the ISSN is an identifier, not a mark of quality. Reynolds reiterated that Beall’s List tars everyone with the same brush. There is a spectrum of publisher behavior from inexperienced or incompetent publishers to those committing outright fraud.

Reynolds stated that the ISSN Center gets questions such as, “Should I publish in journal x?” The ISSN Center response is that they do not evaluate, but they recommend that callers do their research, often referring people to Beall’s List. Ultimately, it is the author’s responsibility to do his or her due diligence. The academic community can help by alerting beginning scholars to this issue. There is a perception that assignment of an ISSN means a title is real or decent, but this is not the case. An ISSN is just a number; it does not identify a country of publication or anything else. The ISSN Center does not want the ISSN to be perceived as enabling this.

Reynolds stated that the ISSN centers are facing a deluge of requests, with some companies asking for hundreds of ISSNs. Brand-new companies are starting with large numbers of titles, for example “*International Journal of X*” or “*American Journal of Y*.” The publishers want ISSNs prior to production of the first issue. Assignment of prepublication ISSNs is no longer routine because of limited staff time and energy. Prepublication ISSNs create double work. The place of publication concept continues to be an issue. When the ISSN started, this was a legitimate concept, but establishment of jurisdiction is now difficult. Publishers are using United States addresses, but the reported address may not be the location where the title is actually produced.

The ISSN International Centre publishes instructions on applying for ISSNs on its website, <http://www.issn.org>. One basis for denial of an ISSN is providing misleading information. This takes research on the part of ISSN staff, not just relying on resources such as Beall’s List. The ISSN centers reserve the right to revoke an ISSN if it becomes clear that the information received from a publisher is fraudulent. Information technology personnel at the ISSN center are working on a process requiring account applications, which will provide an opportunity to evaluate publishers beforehand. This application process will include providing a link to criteria set by the ISSN international organization.

Reynolds stated that there are glimmers of hope. Several groups, including the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE; <http://publicationethics.org/>) and DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals; <http://doaj.org/>) have announced principles of transparency and best practices in scholarly publishing. Perhaps these organizations could provide a home for

vetting and promoting best practice and highlighting awareness.

The ISSN International Centre has released a beta database of OA journals, ROAD (<http://road.issn.org/>). This is a freely available subset of the ISSN database of publications that have been ranked, have validity markers, or have a reputation of global publishing. The ISSN organization hopes this project will serve to display/showcase valid open access publishers. ROAD is supported by UNESCO.

An EBSCO vice president in the audience pointed out that vendors are also dealing with the problem of predatory open access publishers and that EBSCO maintains a list of 11,000 open access journals they feel are reliable.

Continuing Resources Cataloging Forum

The Continuing Resources Cataloging Forum featured presentations on series policy in RDA; updates from the ISSN Center at the Library of Congress, Cooperative Online Serials Program (CONSER) and the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA); and updates and a presentation on the impact of historical practice on RDA and serials cataloging.

Series Policy in RDA

George Prager, head of cataloging, New York University Law School Library, and Robert Maxell, special collections and ancient languages cataloger, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, presented on the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)/Standing Committee on Training (SCT) Series Policy Task Force, which was formed in November 2012; it is not a subgroup of either the PCC/SCT Series Training Task Force or the Series Review group. The members of the task force are Robert Maxwell, George Prager, Ed Jones, and Paul Priebe. The work of the Series Policy Task Force is to recommend new series policies arising from RDA implementation (completed), review all existing LC-PCC-PS and DCM Z1 sections on series (in process), and recommend additions and changes to existing documentation (in process). An interim report addressing FRBR issues, transcription issues, access point issues, and miscellaneous issues was completed January 17, 2014. PCC decisions from the Standing Committee on Standards and the PCC Committee are now needed on task force recommendations. The approved recommendations must then be merged into current LC-PCC PS and series training materials. The task force work will be finished in spring 2014 and documentation should be updated by fall 2014.

Prager and Maxwell presented the highlights of a few policy recommendations. For series numbering transcription (MARC field 490), RDA 2.12.9.2 allows series numbering to be taken from any source in the resource. The task force recommended no change to current policy and to not allow transcription from CIP data, bibliographies, etc. It was recommended that preference be given to Arabic numbers for

Roman or other numbering systems in accordance with RDA 2.12.9.3 and its associated LC-PCC-PS and to follow the RDA first alternative.

RDA 24.6.1.2 allows information used to construct the authorized access point to come from any source (MARC 8XX fields). The task force recommended no change to current policy; series numbering in series authorized access points can be taken from any source. We are reminded that if the series numbering comes from an outside source, there should be no 490 in the bibliographic record. RDA provides no clear instructions in either B5.5 or 24.6 to guide use of abbreviations for captions for series numbering in authorized access points. The task force recommended following LC-PCC PS 24.6.1.3 and abbreviating terms used as part of the numbering as instructed in Appendix B. The task force also recommended substituting Arabic numbers for Roman numerals as recommended in LC-PCC PS 24.6.1.3 in order to produce logical display sequences within the limitations of current library systems. RDA 2.12.9.4 and 24.6.1 allow recording both series numbering and chronological designations as part of the 490/8XX. The task force recommends following RDA as written and adding an example of this to the training materials.

The presentation continued with a discussion of series appearing in multiple languages. A series is by definition an aggregate work. As such, it can exist in more than one expression, including translations. The translation can exist independently of the original or as a bilingual series. For a bilingual series, there was one authorized access point in AACR2; under RDA, we end up with two authorized access points since we are instructed to consider each language portion to be a separate expression. The task force recommends that authority records for series be created at the work level. For bilingual series, this authorized access point would probably only be used for subject access. Separate expression-level authority records should be created for each language expression. These authorized access points are created by appending the language, including the original language, to the authorized access point for the series expression. These authorized access points would be used in the bibliographic records as appropriate. For bilingual series, we have lost the clue of “language & language” in the authorized access point. The task force recommends adding the 655 genre term “bilingual books” to records for this type of publication.

The presentation continued with a discussion of series versus name authority records and series versus non-series authority records. PCC practice under AACR2 was to cancel the name authority record and create a new series authority. This policy more or less forced PCC catalogers to go the analytic route, employing the series authorized access points. The task force felt there were three options for series cataloging processes going forward. The first is to continue current policy, always reviewing and/or amending authority records to treat as series. The second option is to create additional authority records, perhaps qualified by “series.” The

third option is to revise PCC policy to allow a single authority record to authorize either name of series authorized access points. The task force recommends option three, requiring a policy and practice change. In cases where an authorized access point might be used as a series or a name, do not qualify the authorized access point as (series). For examples, see OCLC record number 865167030 (an analytic) and OCLC record number 856191298 (the collected set) with multiple 700 fields. In answer to the question of whether the ISSN should be included in a single work authority record, the task force recommends that it be included.

Slides from this presentation are available via ALA Connect at <http://connect.ala.org/files/20140127%20Series%20Policy%20in%20RDA%20%282%29.pptx>.

Updates from the ISSN Center, CONSER, and CC:DA

Regina Romano Reynolds, director, United States ISSN Center and head of the ISSN Section, Library of Congress reported that the U.S. ISSN Center faces ongoing challenges caused by the activities of predatory open access publishers, but they do not want to use this pejorative term. These publishers range from incompetent to fraudulent, and their impact is significant, with publishers requesting prepublication ISSNs in large batches. The biggest concern is with fraudulent publishers, such as those that take an author's money and then do not publish or claim higher impact factors than they have. Reynolds cited the example of a title claiming to be "sponsored by the Library of Congress." Fraudulent behavior is cause for denial or revocation of ISSNs. Journal scams concern the ISSN centers because of the perception that ISSN is an indicator of quality or legitimacy. Reynolds reminded the audience that the ISSN is just a dumb number; no information is coded into it. ISSN center staff is spending time arguing with these folks, taking away from time they have to assign ISSNs to legitimate publications. The ISSN International Centre has explicit statements about what constitutes an issue at <http://www.issn.org>.

According to Reynolds, one bright spot is that several groups, including the Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, have developed a set of principles of transparency and best practices in scholarly publishing.

The ISSN International Centre has recently developed the ROAD project, a portal directory of open access scholarly resources. This database features metadata drawn from the ISSN center augmented with impact, ratings, etc. The goal of this project is to help combat open access journals that are less than authoritative and to promote high-quality, peer-reviewed publications. ROAD contains metadata for more than 10,000 open access journals from around the world. They will be using schema.org metadata in addition to traditional metadata

and plan to cover institutional repositories and assign ISSNs. See www.road.issn.org for additional information.

Reynolds reported that the Library of Congress has joined The Keepers Registry (<http://thekeepers.org/thekeepers/keepers.asp>), which acts as a global recorder of archiving arrangements for e-journals, and provides metadata for deposited journals. Additionally, the director of the International ISSN Centre is retiring in February 2014. The new director will be Dr. Gaëlle Béquet, formerly head librarian at the École Nationale des Chartes in Paris (France), part of the Sorbonne. The ISSN manual is being updated to keep in synch with RDA and ISBD. A consolidated online traffic manager is being developed. This service will require an account application from publishers before they can request an ISSN. It is hoped that this requirement will help screen problematic publishers. Finally, Reynolds discussed the CIP data block, questioning whether or not the current form of the data block is still desired and whether or not the community wants to keep it in the physical book. It is used, so maybe we could let go of the card format or possibly add a QR code and develop an app that could scan the QR code and pull in a CIP record into catalog.

Les Hawkins, CONSER coordinator, Library of Congress, gave the final date for AACR2 CONSER cataloging as December 31, 2014. This information is posted on the PCC website with questions and answers. The posted information also points to CONSER guidelines for working with existing copy. Recently received revised/revamped CONSER standard record documentation will be posted in February 2014. This documentation will take the place of the CONSER RDA core elements list. The CONSER cataloging manual revision group has completed 18 of 27 modules. These are being posted on the CONSER website as they are completed. A task group is looking at the PCC website. Relevant RDA documentation is currently spread over many different pages, and obsolete material is sitting alongside current material. Numerous fixes have been suggested, and a template for an RDA documentation landing page is in development. There have been some technical issues with Windows 7 installation, which have delayed the project. Hawkins is optimistic that guidelines will be easier to find once the PCC website is updated.

Adolpho Tarango, head-CJK/serials/shared cataloging, Geisel Library, University of California San Diego and CRS liaison to CC:DA, discussed how, at the November 2013 Joint Steering Committee (JSC) meeting, the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek presented their plans to move to latest-entry cataloging. The JSC feels we need systems that allow both earliest- and latest-entry cataloging, recording earliest, intervening, and latest titles. It would be up to individual libraries to choose their preferred authorized access point. It is recommended that each cataloging community continue with their current cataloging practice.

Tarango continued with a discussion about problems with the first five words rule for title changes. This system is

problematic for languages that do not use word division, such as Japanese. The ISSN International Centre is trying to be responsive to countries whose languages do not divide into words. The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) seems to have a simple solution: retain the rule for languages that divide text into words and add language to cover those languages that do not. It is recommended that this language be adopted once development is complete.

At the 2014 American Library Association Annual Conference, CC:DA will tackle the “cascading vortex of horror” for serials. There is disagreement over what to do when publication information is not provided. There are three options: add all the information, since absence of information is problematic for machines; the “hop scotch” approach, providing data as available; or finally providing publication information, then “hop scotch” through distributor and copyright.

Tarango reported that the MARC Advisory Committee has approved a proposal to define 588 indicators 0 and 1. A value of “0” would display as “latest issue consulted”; first indicator “1” would display as “description based on.” The CONSER Standard Record has been updated by the rare book community to add their take. These recommendations are currently being reviewed by the Standing Committee on Standards. The microformat reproductions report is also being reviewed by the Standing Committee on Standards with hopes for a decision for the PCC Operations Committee in May 2014. Finally, the PCC is considering authorizing the term “series” as a form of work qualifier and relationship designator.

See the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) website and blog at <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/> for more information.

The Future Ain't What It Used to Be

Ed Jones, associate director, Assessment & Technical Services, National University Library, San Diego, began his presentation by examining an “ideal catalog,” or Charles Cutter’s catalog of the Boston Athenaeum, produced in 1874. This book catalog is an example of the “golden age of cataloging.” Jones proceeded to explain how Cutter accomplished the “ideal catalog.” It was the 19th century; librarians did not have to deal with translations, multiple formats, or nonbook materials. There was no cooperative cataloging; he did not have to compromise; and he created the catalog as a whole. Additionally, Cutter exploited available technology. Browsing was the dominant theme, and all entries were arranged to take advantage of browsing using typography and layout for clarity. The guiding principles for this catalog were: save space without sacrificing clarity and save the time of the reader. On the other hand, as additions and corrections were discovered, they needed to be added to each volume: The catalog was out of date long before it was published. Of necessity, it was continued by a card catalog starting in 1872.

Jones then outlined the history of catalog card production. The Library of Congress began producing cards in 1902, and their production peaked in 1968. The MARC distribution service began in 1969. OCLC began distributing cards in 1971, and production peaked in 1985 at 131 million cards. By 1995 LC was down to 700,000 cards; they ended card distribution in 1997. During 2012/2013, OCLC produced approximately 700,000 cards. Jones compared the current state of our library catalogs to a Buckminster Fuller car—an odd item created with the best of intentions. Current catalogs are built with an underlying assumption of browsing. Our headings and authority records are set up in a browsing mode. For example, surname, forename, and presume hierarchy, but many of our current catalogs do not offer browsing as an option except in a result set. Underpinning much of our cataloging practice is the question of how things will file. Many of our current catalogs display facets that are created by slicing and dicing the underlying bibliographic data. For example, “creator” usually appears in a 1XX, but may appear in a 7XX; contributors usually appear in a 7XX, but may appear in a 1XX. Without use of relationship designators, there is no foolproof way to tell which is which.

Jones continued with a discussion of the interaction of ISBD elements with FRBR and FRAD. We have always had punctuation, but if you remove an ISBD element there can be consequences because of the way ISBD was integrated into MARC with punctuation inserted at the end of the preceding MARC element. The bad news about FRBR is that FRBR is the future, and our records are the past. Bibliographic records will continue to describe manifestations. What we have now is not quite FRBR, but FRBR-ization, where one manifestation is chosen as an exemplar of a work, which confuses users. OCLC WorldCat expression-level data elements are extracted via “smoke and mirrors” to create the illusion of FRBR in a catalog. Jones presented the example of the representation of his own work with spelling differences between United States and United Kingdom editions. The HathiTrust has its own issues: Multiple records for the same manifestation have holdings inconveniently arranged by donor institution, making it nearly impossible to locate specific volumes, which are easily located using Google. An additional problem for patrons is “TMI, the curse of cut and paste.” Users cut and paste an entire citation into a search box, the Library catalog produces no results, but Google Scholar will find it.

The ISSN is an example of good news. It is the only identifier used heavily in linking relationships, thanks to the ISSN network and MARC fields 760–787. ISSNs can be manipulated to mimic FRBR structure with online versions sharing one ISSN, print and microform versions another, and the versions linked together by an ISSN-L. ISSNs have been assigned to resources both retroactively and willy-nilly, so serials are ready for linked data. Beyond ISSN-L there is the concept of linked editions. Some vendors have been able to show these relationships in an ad hoc way. Linked open data

are heavily dependent on wide buy-in of identifiers (ISBN, ISSN, VIF, and ISNI) and their proper use, but it is difficult to move beyond a given vocabulary. Bibframe, with its structure of creative works, instances, authorities, and annotations, is the future, but it is difficult to keep up.

Jones concluded his presentation with a discussion of where we seem to be going. The catalog currently exists in uneasy tension with the web. In the future, our catalogs will initially look pretty much like today, due to the weight of the past, but in the long term descriptions of physical

resources may be reduced to identities for linking from the web to local item data inventory control. This assumes the adoption of robust identifiers and their retrospective assignment. Descriptions of online resources may be reduced to providing pathways to subscribed resources or may be superseded by a browser plug-in that will detect access rights to a given resource.

Slides from this presentation are available via ALA Connect at: <http://connect.ala.org/files/CRCCForumMW14.pptx>.