

DCRM Appendix (WG4)
Collection Level Cataloging
- A draft position paper by Jain Fletcher -

Rational for collection level guidelines

Collection level guidelines are offered here as a way of addressing an increasing trend towards treating large collections of similar material with one overall record (or a sequence, or a hierarchy, of records). These guidelines are intended to cover groups of materials that consist entirely or mostly of individual pieces that, taken separately, are readily "catalogable", but are being considered for collection level treatment for one of a variety of specific reasons. Although some of these specific reasons will be outlined below, the following scenario gives an indication of how useful such a treatment can be. An institution has procured the library of an 18th century philosopher and one of the specifications is that the library be kept together as a physical unit. The philosopher's library is expected to be a huge boon for research and the institution wants to provide immediate access to the collection, even while starting the process of cataloging each item in it. This measure is undertaken because delay is anticipated during the initial stages, while the institution applies for grant funding. Further delay is expected occur beyond that point, because of the time needed to hire and train staff, as well as to catalog the individual pieces. In this case, a collection level record can be a positive interim solution for providing access.

Inherent in the above scenario are some of the reasons these guidelines are being addressed to a special materials-oriented audience, even though these guidelines would be equally applicable to similar collections held in any kind of library. One of the reasons for this focus is that a special collections library is more likely to be willing to treat collections with particular consideration than a "mainstream" library might. Libraries directed towards the acquisition of more recent materials might well receive collections, but it is less common that they would have a willingness to consider, nor yet that they would have the apparatus in place, for treating such collections in a different way from their ordinary processing. For that reason, such a library will often disperse materials originally gathered as a collection throughout their shelves, often with no acknowledgment of their prior cohesion.

Another reason that these guidelines are included as a part of DCRM and are addressed to a special materials constituency is that there is more likelihood that material having historical significance or rich in bibliographical detail will be deposited in, given to, or collected by special materials libraries. The historical nature or bibliographical interest of such material would call for the type of special attention commended by DCRM, containing as it does accepted rules for descriptive treatment of rare and special materials. While DCRM is not the primary focus of these collection level guidelines, its influence will be recognized at various points throughout.

Material covered by these guidelines

As stated above, there are a variety of reasons why a collection level approach might be considered. Some of the most prominent of these are listed below, as a way of representing the range of potential for these guidelines.

1) Collection level treatment might be employed to address situations where the individual items tend to fall into lower cataloging priorities. Two examples of this kind of situation are given below.

a) *Collections which consist of large numbers of smaller or ephemeral publications.* Examples of these types of publications include printed matter with minimal textual content, such as pamphlets, brochures, catalogs, programs, broadsides and the like. These materials are held by the institution because they are considered worthy adjuncts to the institution's research emphasis or its collecting profile, but having large numbers of them in compact spaces often means that the individual items are seen as more time-consuming to catalog than they are worth. Contributing to the lack of access for these materials is the fact that their size and shape might "doom" them to an existence in boxes, drawers or other out-of-the-way places. In these locations, they may also suffer in a state of little or no organization. These marginalized collections may be known only through word of mouth (if they are known at all) or might be found only through serendipity, if they have at least brief entries in the catalog.

b) *Collections consisting mainly of formats that the institution does not normally catalog, because there are no specialists in those formats on staff.* These would include scores, maps, graphics, and even serials. The library may need to wait for grant funding or have a cooperative agreement with another unit or institution to catalog these other formats, but there can often be a significant delay before the materials are fully cataloged, during which time access is still desirable.

In either of the types of categories given above, the intention is that each piece will eventually be cataloged. In these cases, the collection level record will be deleted when the individual parts have been completed. However, in the short term, collection level cataloging might be seen as a constructive alternative to the idea of allowing such collections to languish. This measure would be undertaken with a commitment to a plan of returning to the collection at a future time--possibly with grant funding firmly in hand--to provide individual cataloging for each piece.

This solution also fits the scenario of the philosopher's library given above, as it would any collection facing potential delays before full cataloging treatment can be rendered.

2) Collection level treatment can be considered for collections whose elements have similarity of title, authorship, subject, or genre/format, might be so extensive that the addition of each piece into a database would generate a multiplicity of similar entries and actually serve to hide rather than aid access to it. This would be a situation where "the forest" cannot be seen for all "the trees". This situation is well described in Nichols' paper [footnote here]. In such a case, collection level treatment may be seen as the best means of access and as the most viable end product for the collection.

3) Collection-level cataloging might also be used for the opposite reason from the first reason listed above. In this case, it would be used for collections that are considered to be of particular importance in the library and already have all their component items either fully or partially cataloged. This measure would be taken as a way of providing better information about the nature of a collection as an entity. Even with a cataloging record for each piece, a collection level record can serve to provide a broad representation of the whole collection, affording yet another way for users to gain a comprehensive understanding of it. In this case, the individually cataloged items would act much like analyzed entries for the collection level record.

There is also a potential variation of the above-described condition, where an institution decides to highlight some of its most prominent collections by selecting images from them for mounting on the Web. In providing a metadata description for each of the images, the institution may be more interested in highlighting the collection itself, rather than, or in addition to, the specific items from which the images came. In this case, a single collection-level record may be created as a representation of the entire collection, for purposes of the metadata record.

4) The guidelines found here may also be used in cases where an institution wants to redress the insufficiencies of an existing record with non-standard collection level treatment. In many institutions, this treatment may have been given in the past for either of the first two reasons above. Staff may even now run across collections described in their catalog records (possibly while performing retrospective conversion projects) where a past cataloger had treated groups of materials in an overarching, yet non-standard kind of way. Since a decision to redress inadequate treatment would require added work, this solution would be appropriate only for those collections deemed worthy of the time spent on extra groundwork.

Material not covered by these guidelines

The situations described above involve collections comprised mostly of previously published material, pulled together either by an individual prior to the institution's receiving it or by institutional staff at some point after receipt. The collection may have been brought together for one of a variety of reasons, but the underlying characteristic of this kind of collection is that its particular amalgamation of items makes the collection entirely unique. It is important to be very clear about this distinction, because these guidelines are not intended to address collections of material that are not unique, such as compilations assembled by publishers (or similar issuing entities) and re-issued as a unit, often as a commercial strategy for reducing stock. Indeed, before approaching the cataloging of a collection, one of the first steps the cataloger should take is to determine whether it was uniquely gathered or there were multiple iterations of the collection intended for distribution to a wider audience. Those collections determined to have been issued as a whole and intended for wider distribution should be considered as published (hereinafter, the term "published" will be used to stand for published, issued, distributed in more than a single iteration). The cataloging guidelines found in DCRM or AACR2 cover this type of publication and its particular features, such as how to provide a title for those found without a unifying title, or how to enter its contents.

Even more importantly, the present guidelines are not intended to cover more "traditional" archival, or manuscript, collections. Archival/manuscript collections are generally comprised of a mixture of materials mostly generated through personal or corporate activity. The majority of this material would be manuscript (letters, diaries, notes, memos, etc.) or printed material not intended for general or commercial distribution (reports, etc.). Guidelines for handling archival/manuscripts collections are addressed in *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts* and in a number of SAA cataloging-related handbooks. Therefore, if such a collection belongs to an institution or unit which does not normally catalog archives/manuscripts, it would be advisable to consider using APPM--or SAA's current archival/manuscripts "best practices" guidelines--and either consult with, or turn the work over to, an experienced archival/manuscripts cataloger.

Expected background/experience of people using these guidelines

Various assumptions steer the style and information found in these guidelines. One of the assumptions is that the libraries and institutions starting to consider collection level treatment of the type specified here do not have archival/manuscripts catalogers in their institutions. Even if they do, it is not uncommon for archival/manuscripts staff to be in a separate unit and not in the same jurisdiction as the rare materials catalogers. Therefore, it is assumed that special materials catalogers with only a modicum of archival cataloging experience would be carrying out this collection level treatment. The guidelines will aim at those at the lower level of experience in archives/manuscripts cataloging and preparation, in order to be able to encompass a broad range of the most important aspects of the work.

Important points to remember

Those experienced in cataloging material at the item level will find that the cataloging of collections has several substantial differences. These differences mean that a number of less familiar record fields will be needed for the cataloging of collections than those used for individual items. Still, once the basic differences are grasped and the array of record fields becomes more familiar, the cataloger will find that creating a collection level cataloging record is not in itself inordinately demanding. As opposed to the job of cataloging individual items, the main challenge to collection level treatment lies in the preparation required before the cataloging can even begin. Considerations related to the preparation phase for collections will be covered in a later section. For now, an overview of some of the central differences between the cataloging of individual items versus collections may be found useful.

Individual items gathered into a collection take on the properties of the collection; in almost every instance, the distinctive attributes of the individual items no longer pertain. For instance, even if all the items were originally published, the collection as a whole is not; a collection of a number of journal titles no longer has the element of seriality; a collection of maps is not an atlas nor is a collection of sheet music an anthology. Instead, in cataloging a collection, that which takes precedence is its main characteristics as a collection. Still, in cases where a collection is entirely composed of the same kind of item (for instance, all broadsides or all scores), elements of the description for the individual items may be used, if appropriate, to enhance its descriptive details.

In item level cataloging, the descriptive portion of a record is derived through the transcription of self-identifying information, generally found on the item itself. On the other hand, a collection, by virtue of its unique nature, carries no inherent overall information that labels or describes it. Therefore, the descriptive portion of a collection level catalog record can only be based on information known or discovered about the entire array of its component items. In other words, while the collection record may indeed be descriptive, it is not transcriptive.

In item level cataloging, the fullness of a record is primarily determined by the cataloger's decision about what level of cataloging standard to apply to it. At the fullest level of cataloging standard, there is an upper limit at which an item may be considered fully cataloged; it is the exclusion of one or more of the entries from the fullest standard of cataloging which results in varying degrees of less-than-full record. In total contrast to this, the fullness of a collection level record is predicated on the amount of information known about the collection itself. Complete knowledge of the collection will generate a greater number of entries and more detail throughout the record. In fact, in many such instances, the cataloger will be in the position of needing to select only the most appropriate information for the record in order not to exceed the byte capacity of a particular online system. On the other hand, less complete knowledge of the collection will result in briefer records, with fewer entries, containing less information.

A majority of institutions contribute their records to a national database. In that arena, item level cataloging records are useful for two main reasons: 1) as a way of letting others know what material exists in the institution, and 2) for cooperative cataloging purposes, as records upon which other institutions can build their own cataloging records. In contrast to this, collection level records only exist in the national databases for the first of these reasons. The uniqueness of the collection makes it a certainty that the record will never act as a shared record for other institutions.

Principles governing these guidelines

The guidelines provided by APPM have appropriate and comprehensive information for the kind of collection targeted here. It has useful definitions and good advice for handling collections, as well as information for filling the descriptive portions of records. Therefore, the present guidelines defer to APPM almost completely for these aspects. Where they differ from APPM in some aspects is in the approach to access-oriented fields, especially related to the entry of name fields. Indeed, the collections targeted by these guidelines are expected to have been gathered together through methods sufficiently different from more traditional archives/manuscripts collections that it is possible to recommend that access fields can be guided by more traditional catalog considerations, such as those found in AACR2 for name and uniform title fields, Library of Congress manuals for topical and geographic access points and a variety of thesauri for genre (etc.) kinds of access.

Following APPM's guidance for the descriptive portion of records affords the cataloger a wealth of fields--especially note fields--to describe a collection. Indeed, many of these fields were made valid for MARC through the efforts of the archives/manuscripts community for online use because of their benefits for describing collections. A few of these fields are of central value to collection records and are highlighted in these guidelines. Others are briefly

described as a way to explore the variety of potential uses, but are not necessarily treated expansively here. This leads to mention of another advantage in following APPM guidelines: when specific information is needed to describe a collection. Either APPM or the MARC can be perused to find for additional appropriate fields.

Possibly the most important reason for using APPM conventions for describing collections is to provide a way to make clear distinctions between records for published collections and those for unique compilations. By using two sets of guidelines, each developed as appropriate for this broad breakdown of material ("published" and "collection"), the records made for each type will have features that readily identify them as such. Otherwise, when unique and published collections are both described using book-oriented rules or rationalizations, the distinction between published and unique collections blurs. As these records co-exist in databases (whether local or national), these distinctions are important.

A cautionary anecdote

It might be tempting for some managers to suggest that catalogers give collection level treatment to large groups of material in the hopeful belief that this would be a fairly simple process where books are packed into boxes, then given a record with a brief title, an indication of approximate number of items and perhaps some broad subject access. However, it must be made clear that the lack of some or any preparation means that the collection record will suffer significantly. There is no value to a collection level record that has so little information known about it that it carries no useful details, or even worse, contains erroneous information. The following is a worst-case scenario demonstrating the truth of this statement, taken from a real situation (since rectified, in this case with individual records, because of the collection strengths of the institution). Before any assessment was made of the individual components, the collection level record was presented thus:

245 10 Collection of Mexican pamphlets
300 86 boxes (ca. 5400 items)

Even a brief collection level record at the standard suggested herein could have been more informative, but it would have required more investigation than was evident with this record. One of its critical deficiencies was the lack of any indication of the time period of coverage. Further assessment of the collection yielded the information that it contained imprints from the early 1600s to the mid-1800s. Furthermore, these imprints were found to be not just from Mexico, but also from most of the known printing cities throughout Latin America. The discovery of time range and the geographical distribution made the collection far more valuable than originally indicated, since many of the imprints were found to be among the first ever from certain printing areas. Moreover, this discovery of the dating also changed the nature of the designation of the imprints; these were not pamphlets, in fact they were books that were still in their original, pre-binding state.

The preparation stage

When considering whether or not to apply collection level treatment to a unique compilation of materials, it is crucial to be cognizant of the time needed for the preparation (also known as processing) of the items within the collection. There are many issues that need to be

addressed during the processing stage, including such matters as preservation and physical preparation ("housing") details. One of the most important points to make here, as well as to consider during this stage, is *who* does the processing. Unless the institution has severely limited staffing and therefore, little or no flexibility in this decision, the physical processing can be assigned to support staff. In the case of the organization, arrangement, description and analysis aspects of the preparation, it may also be done with support staff, with cataloger training, review and general oversight. In these latter aspects, it would be useful to be open to considering the possible options. The most favorable solution would be to garner the assistance of an expert in the area(s) of the collection's focus. [Footnote: The scholar who provided this assistance to Cornell's French Revolution collection, as described in Nichol's paper, was a crucial element to their being able to make such rich collection level records; that experience represents the epitome of this idea.] For the processing, it would be useful to consider a range of assistants potentially available to the institution: college or graduate students, volunteers with pertinent interests, staff with particular expertise, etc.

For the current focus of these guidelines, the pertinent issue is the gathering of relevant information for the data file related to the collection, which will also subsequently feed into the catalog record. It must be noted that the catalog record cannot be made until there is a finding aid. This is because, according to APPM, the catalog description of a collection is based on its finding aid, which is then considered the chief source for the catalog record. For the purposes of the collection level records affected here, this finding aid need not be formal; it can simply be a file folder of information related to the collection, such as decision memos, the register of bibliographic citations, information about the collection and the collector, acquisitions information, names of the processors, and so on. In order to be in strict compliance with APPM concerning the chief source for the subsequent catalog record, there should at least be one sheet in the folder containing the official name of the collection, along with some other useful information. In fact, this sheet can be a parallel document to the catalog record; its recommended contents are described below. Still, the entire file will inevitably hold more information that the catalog record can, or should, carry. Needless to say, file folders for collections should be located in a place accessible to all staff, in order to provide reference for them.

As a part of the organizing stage for the collection (at the level determined by decision-makers at the institution), it is helpful to keep track of the information discovered while processing. This information will help to fill in the elements of the subsequent descriptive records (first the finding aid, then the catalog record). Therefore, it is critical at this stage to know the nature of the information called for in either or both types of descriptive record. The cataloger should work closely with the processor(s) to communicate the content requirements of the projected records, perhaps even creating a template to help the processors towards this end. It is highly recommended that the final output of the processor(s) be in electronic form (e.g., word processing or database programs). Having material in electronic form can be put to beneficial use in subsequent applications, such as in preparation of the catalog record or providing content for a Website.

As stated much earlier, there is a panoply of collection-oriented fields available to the processor/cataloger for these records. A rich assortment of these may be used as needed; however, there are six descriptive elements that should be considered central to the record. This is also basic information that the processor should be compiling. From there, a

commitment should be made to cover these elements as fully as possible in the catalog record, whenever they pertain and to the degree they can be filled in from the information the processing has revealed. (Omitted here is something so basic to a library record that it does not need explanation: an indication of the collection's location, i.e., call number or shelving label.)

- 1) ***Title.*** This is the unique identifying information for the record of the collection. It should be brief, yet informative, with sufficient information to represent briefly as many as possible of the following aspects: geographical, chronological, topical, format (example, "British and American Revolutionary War pamphlets"). The fitness of the title will depend to some extent on the amount of preparation given to the collection. The institution may desire a standard title layout for their collections, for instance, that they all start with the same few words (e.g., "A collection of ..."). A part of the consideration of the form of the title may be how the institution would like the collection cited if it is used in research. There is a field for desired citation forms in MARC21 (524).
- 2) ***Range of dates.*** This should be as accurate as possible given the amount of preparation devoted to the collection. Full processing should not only pin the dates down to the exact year on either end, it might also yield a statement of "inclusive" and "bulk" dates, if such a distinction applies. A shorter time for processing will yield a less firm grasp of date coverage, but approximations are allowed.
- 3) ***Extent.*** The housing and physical processing has to be complete before it is possible to provide exact details of the extent of the collection, whether that is expressed as items, boxes, cartons, etc.
- 4) ***Organization and arrangement.*** Whenever the collection has been sorted into categories, the breakdown can be listed in this field, which, when present, forms a nice pairing with the next field for providing a good impression of the collection.
- 5) ***Scope and content.*** This statement, along with the next one, are probably the most crucial of the record. They are also probably the most-time consuming of all to prepare for either of the records. To offset that concern, it might be worth bearing in mind that these notes might also be mined for information for a Web page summary of the institution's collections.

This statement needs to be a dispassionate synopsis of the scope or content of the collection. As such, it should be as factual and concise as possible; opinions ("judgment" terms) about any aspect of the collection by the preparer of this field should be avoided. It can contain such elements as mention of the highlights of the collection, a listing of the prominent authors, genres, topics (etc.) found within. No information found here (nor anywhere in the record, for that matter) should overstate any aspects of the holdings; for this, it is worth keeping in mind that people may travel to the institution on the basis of the information provided about it.

- 6) ***History/biographical note.*** The collection usually calls for one or the other of these notes, rarely both. A biographical style note might be made for an author, a

printer, the collector or someone else closely responsible for the collection. The historical note gives context to the contents. A common mistake made by novices is repeating information from the scope and content field in this one, and vice versa. It is useful to remember the field being filled in order to avoid this duplicative effort.

Supporting documentation along with the finding aid

Note that the preceding list of "critical" aspects does not include any form of item description. This does not mean that item description is not important, but that it is possible to omit it in a record as an option for economy of time and effort. This option is provided for those institutions that choose collection level treatment to reduce the time, effort and expense of full or even partial cataloging service per item (i.e., description/transcription, authority searching, subject analysis, bibliographic history research, etc.). Even without item description, almost every element listed above depends on a certain amount of awareness of the component items. Furthermore, passing that awareness on in the notes listed above (especially the "Scope and content" and "Arrangement" notes), can convey some impression of the contents of the collection. However, many institutions will desire some level of itemization. Not only will itemization of any kind be useful in itself, it will also serve to enhance further the notes above. This itemization might take broad form, such as a breakdown by type of material, by issuing bodies, by subject or some other collocating device. On the other end of the scale, a more detailed alternative to full service cataloging would be a bibliographical listing of each item in the collection. This would have the advantage of making each title available to researchers, either offline or via a link in the catalog record to an electronic version of the list. For that reason, it is strongly urged that entries be made in a standard descriptive style. A highly recommended bibliographic style for earlier material would contain the descriptive portion of a catalog record, entered in a string with full ISBD punctuation, transcribed (and abbreviated) according to the guidance and options offered by the appropriate DCRM manual for the format of the item(s). The following is a sample of some bibliographic entries using this style of description, for the collection whose title is given below in italic type.

A collection of chapbooks published in Edinburgh, 1804-1875.

Life of David Haggart who was executed at Edinburgh [sic], 18th July, 1821, for the murder of the Dumfries jailor : containing the whole of his depredations and murders faithfully copied from the large book written by himself : being the whole substance without the superfluity of language, brought into the following pages : with an account of his behaviour at the place of execution. Edinburgh : Printed for the booksellers, 1823. 24 p. ; 16 cm.

[or, the above, briefer:]

Life of David Haggart who was executed at Edinburgh [sic], 18th July, 1821, for the murder of the Dumfries jailor ... Edinburgh : Printed for the booksellers, 1823. 24 p. ; 16 cm.

On the impropriety and evil of attending plays, and other theatrical performances. Edinburgh : Printed for James Scott ..., 1824. 12 p. ; 17 cm.

The vices of the tavern dissected, or, Drunkenness laid open : a poem ... / by John Mitchie. Tenth edition. Edinburgh : Printed for the author, 1820. 36 p. ; 19 cm.

The advantage of this solution is that the work can be performed by support staff. While it would require training and review by a professional, the majority of the work can take place outside the cataloging arena. So, although this solution signifies a considerable reduction of detail with respect to the option of individually cataloging each item, it still represents a significant efficiency and economy in terms of making information about holdings available.

Two versions of a finding aid

The following finding aids, with their introductory scenarios, were created from scratch for the purposes of example only. Inherent in both their scenarios and their substance are various issues for use with this example and the catalog examples later on.

Version 1 - Partial

This version of the finding aid shows the results of a processing effort where very little about the topic in question is known. In this case, the lack of knowledge is mainly due to the fact that very little is known at all (at this point; but see next version) about this extinct island. Taken as a whole, it represents the decision at the institution to try to organize the collection just enough to be able to give it some description and some access. It should be noted that all details are accurate to the extent they are known by the processors.

FINDING AID: ISLA DE LA PAZ

TITLE: Collection of printed material from Isla de la Paz

DATES OF COVERAGE: ca. 1600-ca. 1745

EXTENT: 83 cartons, 11 document boxes, 7 oversize boxes

ORGANIZATION AND ARRANGEMENT: 1) Material in English; 2) Material in French; 3) Material in German; 4) Material in Spanish, Italian, Portuguese; 5) Material in Latin and Greek; 6) Isla de la Paz imprints.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: Isla de la Paz was a small island in the South Pacific Ocean. It was first discovered by Spanish explorers in 1614. European settlement began on the island soon after its discovery. There was a library of books and pamphlets and other printed matter on the island for the use of the settlers. The island disappeared in 1747, but the library was saved and kept with the Gardiner family, until the last surviving direct descendant of the Gardiner family died, at which time it was willed to the College of the Virginias, with the provision that it be kept intact.

SCOPE AND CONTENT: The collection consists of a variety of imprints from Europe in the major European languages, as well as in Latin and classical Greek. There are also imprints from Isla de la Paz in most of the European languages.

Version 2 - Full

This version of the finding aid represents a substantial revision. This was undertaken as a result of the work of an independent scholar from Florida, already researching Isla de la Paz from its few known remaining manuscript artifacts (correspondence and diaries), held at an institution in Maryland. When the scholar learned about this extant library from the short record (above), he offered to help organize it. His efforts not only resulted in a complete reorganization of the collection but also a scholarly publication.

FINDING AID: ISLA DE LA PAZ

TITLE: Collection of books, pamphlets, newspapers and broadsides from Isla de la Paz

DATES OF COVERAGE: inclusive, 1602-1743; bulk, 1635-1740

EXTENT: 83 cartons, 11 document boxes, 7 oversize boxes

ORGANIZATION AND ARRANGEMENT: 1) Religious books and pamphlets; 2) Agriculture; 3) Herbals and health pamphlets; 4) House and home management; 5) Literature and reading materials; 6) Isla de la paz imprints: newspapers and broadsides.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: Isla de la Paz was a small island about 23 miles long by 11 miles wide located in the Tuiasosopo Islands in the South Pacific Ocean. It was first discovered by Spanish explorers in 1614. Having long been a stopover for Asian traders, when that first European contingent reached it they found it to be inhabited not only by its native population, but also by people of Chinese and Japanese descent. The Spanish found the climate so temperate and the people so open and generous that they gave it the name, "Peaceful Island". As soon as word of the island's existence spread around Europe, expeditions from many countries followed, launched in the hopes of future colonization. In the short span of some twenty years after its discovery by Europeans, Isla de la Paz became settled by English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese people, living in fairly harmonious co-existence with each other and with the original inhabitants. The settlers, always in need of instructive, informational and devotional reading material, depended on the visiting ships for their books, sent by people from their home countries. Because much of the reading material was of practical nature and of wide use, it was kept in a central location, in the house of a recognized local leader (James Gardiner), where it was made available for perusal or borrowing by anyone on the island. This library of books and pamphlets might have been the only printed matter on the island had it not been for a shipwreck on the shores of Isla de la Paz during a bad storm in 1682. The ill-fated ship had been carrying a printing press and printing supplies to another destination, which the settlers were able to rescue before the ship was totally broken up by the rough sea. After its successful installation, the press was used by all the island settlers for printing newspapers, broadsides and, presumably, although no artifacts remain, ephemeral material. In 1740, it became clear that the island was becoming inundated and would soon be uninhabitable. The island populace reluctantly began moving away, carrying all their belongings to other destinations. It is believed that no human life remained on the island by the time it disappeared in 1747. The library, which had grown quite large by this time, had been crated and sent away with the descendants of its long-time caretakers, the Gardiner family. The island Gardiners were reunited with their British relatives who had by that time settled in Virginia, in America. The island's library was kept intact and practically untouched for over two centuries in the

family's mansion in Virginia. In 1983, when the last surviving direct descendant of the Gardiner family died, she willed it to the College of the Virginias, with the provision that it be kept intact.

SCOPE AND CONTENT: The collection consists of a variety of imprints from Europe in the major European languages, as well as in Latin and classical Greek. Of the religious material, there are Bibles, missals, psalm books and other devotional material, mostly of the Catholic faith, but Lutheran and Anglican texts are also present. There is a great deal of material of a utilitarian nature, relating to management of home and property, as well as to health care. Literature published in European countries, dating mostly from the period of the island's European settlement, is also represented. Of the imprints from Isla de la Paz, there are full runs of two of the island's newspapers, *Aujourd'hui en l'île* and *The Island Clarion*, as well as miscellaneous issues of most of the others.

Overall considerations about collection level cataloging

Drawing from various points raised heretofore, the following are a few comments about the basic nature of collections that should help understand rationale behind the use of certain fields in the catalog record.

- 1) Although it has many things in common with it, the catalog record for the collection is not the finding aid and therefore does not need to be a replication of it. Instead it can be viewed as a pointer to the finding aid or to the collection itself. For practical reasons alone (e.g., space considerations), it should be expected that information on the catalog record will often need to be synthesized from the information found on the finding aid.
- 2) Everything about a collection level record is supplied from information found during the preparation of a collection for its descriptive phases. As noted earlier, the first descriptive phase is some form of finding aid. Once the finding aid is in place, APPM guidance is that the chief source of information for the catalog record is the finding aid. Therefore, in a catalog record for the collection, very little (if any) information need be bracketed. In the same way, instances of purely local notes (590 or 500 \$5) need only rarely (if ever) be considered. It is well to remember that the record itself is entirely comprised of "local" information.
- 3) Since the collection is not published, the publication area (260) should not be used at all. Instead, the inclusive and/or bulk date subfields (\$f and/or \$g) in the title field (245) provide complete date-related information. An additional benefit of placing the dates directly after the title is that this provides a readily distinguishable clue that the record as one for a collection.
- 4) The formatted contents note (505) should be avoided entirely. Using a contents note gives the impression that the items were issued as part of a whole and renders ambiguous whether this is a unique compilation or not. There are two excellent fields that can be used instead for unique collections: 1) the scope and contents (520) note, which is an informal note intended summarize the content and 2) the organization and arrangement (351) note.

5) Series of a "traditional" bibliographic kind do not pertain in collections. If the collection contains a large number of items associated with a series to which the institution wants to provide access, series tracing fields (4xx/8xx) should be avoided in the collection level record. Instead, the series may be traced in a uniform title field (e.g., 730). Furthermore, institutions that choose to collocate "analyzed" items from a locally devised collection through use of a locally defined series, should make use of the access points devised for local purposes (e.g., 793) in their MARC records for the individual items, in order not to interfere or be confused with fields containing true series transcriptions and tracings for published works.

6) Unlike most monographic publications, the catalog record for a collection may well be altered, sometimes on an almost regular basis (e.g., the curator devotes a portion of the budget to acquire books to fill in the collection), sometimes as new information becomes known (as in the extreme example of the change in finding aid versions above). So, every collection level record should be considered capable of being altered at some point and time may need to be budgeted for this aspect.

Assembling a collection level catalog record from its processing information

At this point, everything is ready to create a catalog record. With the preparation finished and the basic rationale in place, this is really the easiest part. It is even more straightforward if the processor has provided an electronic copy of the finding aid, because that can be used to cut and paste information into the appropriate MARC fields in the online cataloging database. The following two records are catalog records for the two versions of finding aids above, given in MARC format. They are not necessarily complete, but show how the known information about a collection, as well as some local information, can be used to supply content in the record.

Cataloging version 1 - Partial

245 00 Collection of printed material from Isla de la Paz, \$f
ca. 1600-ca. 1745.

300 11 \$f boxes (5.5 linear ft.)

300 83 \$f cartons (166 linear ft.)

300 7 \$f oversize boxes.

351 Arranged in the following series: 1) Material in English; 2) Material in French; 3) Material in German; 4) Material in Spanish, Italian, Portuguese; 5) Material in Latin and Greek; 6) Isla de la Paz imprints..

520 The collection consists of a variety of imprints from Europe in the major European languages, as well as in Latin and classical Greek. There are also imprints from Isla de la Paz in most of the European languages.

524 Collection of printed material from Isla de la Paz (Collection 23). Special Libraries, College of the Virginias, Roanoke, VA.

541 Joan (Gardiner) Hockett; \$c gift; \$d 1999.

540 [Institution's boilerplate **copyright** statement.]

545 Isla de la Paz was a small island in the South Pacific Ocean. It was first discovered by Spanish explorers in 1614. European settlement began on the island soon after its discovery. There was a library of books and pamphlets and other printed matter on the island for the use of the settlers. The island disappeared in 1747, but the library was saved and kept with the Gardiner family, until the last surviving direct descendant of the Gardiner family died, at which time it was willed to the College of the Virginias, with the provision that it be kept intact.

651 0 Isla de la Paz ...

Cataloging version 2 - Full

245 00 Collection of books, pamphlets, newspapers and broadsides from Isla de la Paz, \$f 1602-1743, \$g 1635-1740.

300 11 \$f boxes (5.5 linear ft.)

300 83 \$f cartons (166 linear ft.)

300 7 \$f oversize boxes.

351 Arranged in the following series: 1) Religious books and pamphlets; 2) Agriculture; 3) Herbals and health pamphlets; 4) House and home management; 5) Literature and reading materials; 6) Isla de la paz imprints: newspapers and broadsides.

520 The collection consists of a variety of imprints from Europe in the major European languages, as well as in Latin and classical Greek. Of the religious material, there are Bibles, missals, psalm books and other devotional material, mostly of the Catholic faith, but Lutheran and Anglican texts are also present. There is a great deal of material of a utilitarian nature, relating to management of home and property, as well as to health care. Literature published in European countries, dating mostly from the period of the island's European settlement, is also represented. Of the imprints from Isla de la Paz, there are full runs of two of the island's newspapers, *Aujourd'hui en l'île* and *The Island Clarion*, as well as miscellaneous issues of most of the others.

524 Collection of printed material from Isla de la Paz (Collection 23). Special Libraries, College of the Virginias, Roanoke, VA.

541 Joan (Gardiner) Hockett; \$c gift; \$d 1999.

540 [Institution's boilerplate **copyright** statement.]

544 \$d Letters and diaries from Isla de la Paz (Ms. Coll. 147) \$a Available at Manuscripts Dept., Maryland Historical Institute.

545 Isla de la Paz was a small island located in the Tuigasosopo Islands in the South Pacific Ocean, first discovered by Spanish explorers in 1614. In the twenty years after its discovery by Europeans, Isla de la Paz became settled by English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese people. The settlers, always in need of instructive, informational and devotional reading material, depended on the visiting ships for their books, sent by people from their home countries. Isla de la Paz acquired a printing press in 1682 after which the press was used by all the island settlers for printing newspapers, broadsides and possibly ephemeral material. By 1740, it was clear that the island was sinking so inhabitants moved away, carrying all their belongings to other destinations. The island disappeared in 1747. The large library of books was crated and sent away with the descendants of its long-time caretakers, the Gardiner family. After that, the library was kept intact and practically untouched for over two centuries in the family's mansion in Virginia. In 1983, when the last surviving direct descendant of the Gardiner family died, she willed it to the College of the Virginias, with the provision that it be kept intact.

555 Unpublished finding aid available; inquire at Dept. of Special Collections reference desk.

651 0 Isla de la Paz \$x Sources.

655 7 Broadsides \$z Isla de la Paz. \$2 rbgenr

655 7 Newspapers \$z Isla de la Paz. \$2 rbgenr

730 0 Aujourd'hui en l'^ile

730 0 Island clarion

856 42 \$u<http://www.library.collvirginias/libraries/isladelapaz.htm> \$zInternet version of the finding aid available on the World Wide Web.

Further uses of finding aid documentation

Note that there is a URL in the second catalog record linking to the Web version of the finding aid. The finding aid is easily posted when its documentation is in electronic form. If there is no official electronic repository for finding aids, it is still possible for the institution to post the collection's bibliographic inventory on the Web and provide a link to that. In addition, the information and text of the finding aid can also be harvested for the institution's Web listing of collection highlights.