ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Materials Cataloging Interest Group
ALA Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, NV
Sunday, June 29, 2014

Notes: Marc McGee, Harvard Library, Cataloging Interest Group Coordinator

Approximately 27 people participated in the joint ALCTS CaMMS/MAGIRT Cartographic Materials Cataloging Interest Group.

Announcements and Updates:

MAGIRT-RDA Listserv
A new listserv (magirt-rda@ala.org) was established in October 2013 as a dedicated forum for discussing the cataloging of cartographic materials using RDA. As of late June 2014 there were 90 subscribers to the list and 75+ posts. The list is hosted by the ALA Mail List Service and an archive of posts is maintained on the ALA lists web site. The list is open to ALA members and non-members alike. To sign-up: http://lists.ala.org/sympa/info/magirt-rda

Basic Map Librarianship / Cataloging and Classification LibGuide page
Katherine Rankin, Mary Larsgaard, and Hallie Pritchett have put together a Basic Map Librarianship resource guide as part of the MAGIRT Accidental Map Librarian program that includes a tab devoted to cataloging and classification resources for cartographic materials:
http://magirt.ala.libguides.com/content.php?pid=471777&sid=3861585

Princeton Digital Maps Search
Tsering Wangyal Shawa announced that Princeton University Library has a new interface for spatial searching of Princeton's digital maps and geographic data: http://map.princeton.edu/search/

GeoHumanities Special Interest Group
Kathy Weimer invited people to participate in the GeoHumanities Special Interest Group, a group interested in geospatial research in the humanities. Participation in the group is free and open. Information on the group including listserv sign-up: http://geohumanities.org/

Discussion topics included:

- How to address the recording of hierarchical place names for imaginary places in the MARC 662 field.

  Colleen Cahill from the Library of Congress brought up the problem that imaginary place names are theme authorities and are not authorized for use in the MARC 662 Hierarchical Place Name field. The group discussed possible ways to address this problem. One solution proposed is to add an indicator to the 662 field that would indicate if a place in imaginary. Another solution would be to add subfields to the 662 for imaginary places. Another solution proposed is to wait to see if developments of RDA include imaginary places being moved together with geographic places in the authority files. Colleen is requesting feedback (cstu@loc.gov) from the community to be able to take to the MARC Advisory Committee. Susan Moore offered to

present the issue to the Canadian, German, and British MARC communities. Colleen offered to put together examples of how these headings would look in a MARC record. Susan suggested the possibility of drafting a discussion paper with different solutions to present to the MARC Advisory Committee. The general consensus of the group was that the use of an indicator in the 662 to designate when a place is imaginary would likely be the best solution since it offers a consistency of coding and the possibility of building a display note from the indicator.

- Feedback on the MAGIRT Cataloging and Classification Committee's Task Force on Best Practices draft documentation, "Best Practices for Cataloging Cartographic Resources Using RDA."

    Susan Moore, Chair of the MAGIRT Cataloging & Classification Committee, presented a draft of "Best Practices for Cataloging Cartographic Resources Using RDA" and asked for feedback about what type of information would be most useful to include in the Best Practices document. The initial draft is based on the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division Cataloging Team best practices documentation. The Task Group is looking for feedback on: How much detail to include? Whether to include RDA instructions? Whether to organize it based on MARC field or RDA instruction? What examples to include? What areas to focus on, e.g. changes from AACR2 or a more comprehensive set of guidelines? etc. Feedback can be sent to Susan Moore (susan.moore@uni.edu) which will be shared with the Task Group or discussion can be posted to the magirt-rda@ala.org list.

    Participants suggested it would be helpful to focus on areas where RDA might not be explicit in guidance for cartographic materials (e.g. whether or not to include the word "Scale" at the beginning of the 255; including lists of relationship designators for cartographic materials). It was also suggested that including MARC examples would be helpful. These best practices could be used to further inform RDA development and/or LC/PCC Policy Statements. Once complete, the Best Practices document will be shared via the MAGIRT LibGuide. The Best Practices document is intended to be changed and revised as RDA evolves and as the need for specific best practices guidance arises from community discussion. Revisions will be announced to the community via listservs.

    Marc McGee will share the Harvard RDA for Maps documentation, which includes an examples document and a quick reference spreadsheet, with the Task Group.

    One open question is how much RDA text can be quoted in Best Practices documentation without violating copyright restrictions.

- Digital humanities and the usefulness of Library of Congress Authorities for linked open data projects, including how best to record coded time and dates in place name authorities.

    Kathy Weimer posed to the group the idea that digital humanities projects are now often employing gazetteers in their work along with an interest in time periods and was wondering how libraries can make authority data a more relevant and useful resource for these projects. In particular having encoded dates associated with geographic place names could potentially be a very useful linked open data access point for the digital humanities community.

Paige Andrew suggested the MARC authorities 046 Special Coded Dates field as a potential way to encode dates for computer processing purposes. The 046 field includes subfields for a start period ($$s) and an end period ($$t) which can be used to express time periods.

Also the MARC 034 includes subfields for a beginning date ($$x) and an ending date ($$y) that can be used to associate a time period with specific geographic coordinate information.

Kathy asked a follow-up question: Are coordinates in the authority files being automatically added to and used in bibliographic records? The long term goal is to use the coordinates in authority records to augment existing bibliographic records with coordinate data for maps and other format materials as well. The University of Minnesota noted that they have done some work retrospectively adding coordinate data to bibliographic records by selecting the "easier" geographies to start and populating the MARC 034 for those records where a single geographic subject heading clearly corresponds to an identifiable set of coordinates.

- Usefulness of crowd sourced metadata vs. defined schemas for describing digital collections materials, a discussion based on *American Libraries* article: "Metadata for Image Collections" by Eddie Woodward, June 2014, pp. 42-44.
  http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/7ec7b368?page=44

  Mary Larsgaard introduced the concepts from the article to the group and suggested that the article had many good points to make regarding the limitations of crowd sourcing as a method for creating metadata for digital collections. The general consensus of the group was that employing a metadata schema from beginning of these projects is preferable to letting the crowd do the work, which oftentimes, either never fully develops or is inadequate to the point of uselessness. Mary also wanted to know whether institutions had experienced tensions around the decision to use standard cataloging vs. metadata creation for digital collections. It was noted that sometimes when decisions are made to expedite the creation of metadata and certain access points are left out, it can limit the re-use of that metadata and hinder participation in other, future digital projects.

  While it was generally agreed that crowd sourcing has its limitations for creating useful metadata there are some interesting projects that employ crowd sourcing techniques that have the potential to be used to augment existing metadata. Examples mentioned were: the New York Public Library Map Warper tool (http://maps.nypl.org/warper/) which allows users to georeference historic map images, thus capturing potentially useful coordinate data of the geographic extent of maps. The New York Public Library Building Inspector (http://buildinginspector.nypl.org/), through crowd sourcing, enables users to help computers identify building footprints and capture attribute data from digitized historic fire insurance atlases. Also the New York Public Library "What's on the menu?" project allows users to transcribe data from historic restaurant menus: http://menus.nypl.org/ converting data to searchable text.