

University at Albany, State University of New York

## Scholars Archive

---

University Libraries Faculty Scholarship

University Libraries

---

2018

## Benchmarking Vended Authority Control Practices in ARL Libraries

Rebecca Mugridge

*University at Albany, State University of New York, rmugridge@albany.edu*

Rebecca Nous

*University at Albany, State University of New York, rnous@albany.edu*

Nancy Poehlmann

*University at Albany, State University of New York, npoehlmann@albany.edu*

Wendy West

*University at Albany, State University of New York, wwest@albany.edu*

The University at Albany community has made this article openly available.

**Please share** how this access benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib\\_fac\\_scholar](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib_fac_scholar)



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Mugridge, Rebecca; Nous, Rebecca; Poehlmann, Nancy; and West, Wendy, "Benchmarking Vended Authority Control Practices in ARL Libraries" (2018). *University Libraries Faculty Scholarship*. 163.

[https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib\\_fac\\_scholar/163](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib_fac_scholar/163)

### Rights Statement



### License

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholars Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholars Archive.

Please see [Terms of Use](#). For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@albany.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@albany.edu).

## **Benchmarking Vended Authority Control Practices in ARL Libraries**

Authority control is key to maintaining the quality and integrity of the online catalog. Many libraries perform some activities that fall under the umbrella of authority control, including catalog maintenance activities to correct or update headings in the online catalog; import authority records for new or changed headings; create name or subject-authority records in the national database or in the local catalog; or contract with a vendor to supply some of those services. To gauge the use of vendors in support of authority-control activities, the authors conducted a survey of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries. The authors designed a survey to investigate the use of vendors to maintain an authority file in their online catalogs and to process current cataloging records. The authors inquired about the libraries' integrated library system (ILS), whether they expected to migrate within the next 3 years, and whether they anticipated any aspect of authority control at their institution to change in the next 3 years. The authors sought to identify trends and correlations between these and other factors. They believe that the survey results will serve as benchmarks for other libraries and be helpful to them as they evaluate their authority control practices and consider vendors as tools to support their authority control activities.

### **Literature Review**

The authors examined the library science literature published between 1999 and August 2017 to review current practices and trends in the management and implementation of vended, authority-control processes. Although the literature on this topic is limited, the authors found 7 useful examples. They include 2 overviews of vended authority control, 4 case studies, and 2 surveys of academic libraries.

Vellucci (2004) examined the available vendor services for authority control, exploring the reasons for outsourcing authority control and the services provided by the vendors. The reasons vary. The labor-intensive nature of authority control means that libraries with budget or staff cuts may need professional librarians in other service areas, vended authority control offers controlled costs and increased efficiency, and it provides an expertise that may be lacking in the cataloging unit. Vellucci explores the services offered by authority control vendors, including retrospective cleanup of the base file and linking the bibliographic records to the authority file. Vendors also offer ongoing authority control, addressing both newly cataloged bibliographic records and previously cataloged records where headings in the authority file have changed. Vellucci describes the machine processing of the records and gives examples of the headings and statistical reports that a vendor can generate for a library. Outlining the use of vendor manual review and correction, Vellucci suggests that the library should look at the percentage of linked headings. A high linkage rate, such as 94%, would indicate that manual review is not worth the cost, but if it is low, 78% for example, manual review might be worth the added expense. However, Vellucci suggests, “the library should select a vendor that can give the highest linkage rate (90-95%) through machine processing” (Vellucci, 2004, p. 450).

Zhu and Von Seggern (2005) concentrate on what to expect from an authority-control vendor and what to do on the local level. The authors define and give examples of common problems encountered with automated authority control, address special cases such as series titles, and form and genre headings, and point out the high cost of manual review. Their conclusion reiterates that vended authority control is not perfect, stating “[i]f the library decides to use vended authority control, staff must be assigned to coordinate the program,

monitor the process, review reports from the vendor, keep an eye on what might go wrong, and fix the problematic headings that vended authority control cannot handle. Short and long-term review of the authority control system and process will determine whether the choice is cost-effective" (Zhu & Von Seggern, 2005, p. 65).

In the first case study, Lam (2001) reported on the experiences of the University of Saskatchewan Libraries as librarians implemented a vended, authority-control process. The labor-intensive process of managing authority control in-house, as well as severe budget constraints impelled them to look to outsourcing authority-control activities. After conducting a literature review, consulting with other libraries, and performing a comparative study of three vendors (Autographics, Library Technologies Inc. (LTI), and OCLC), they settled on LTI. Lam concluded that the decision to outsource authority control activities was a good one, finding that the cost is manageable and they have a "more-than-acceptable level of heading consistency" (Lam, 2001, p. 64)

Aschmann (2002) provided a concise but detailed overview of the process of contracting with a vendor to provide authority control for online library catalogs with details gathered from Virginia Tech library and the Wichita State University Libraries. Aschmann discussed the various authority control activities for both the vendors and the library staff, giving realistic expectations about the impact on library staffing. Aschmann also offers practical advice for librarians when developing an RFP for authority control services, as well as a checklist of information to gather from vendors.

Tsui and Hinders (1999) compared the cost of Blackwell North America's Authority and Notification Services to the cost of having staff manually performing the same tasks. The

authors determined that vendor services were a fraction of the cost of staff, even taking into account the decision to continue manually checking headings for the new OCLC Enhance Project member records. They concluded that outsourcing the majority of their authority control processes resulted in improved cataloging efficiency and helped to improve library users' search and discovery results, and that it would be "difficult and costly to achieve a comparable quality of online catalog maintenance without the assistance of a vendor's authority service" (Tsui & Hinders, 1999, p. 60).

The London School of Economics (LSE) libraries undertook an effort to reconcile name, subject, and title authority inconsistencies and errors in their catalog (Williams, 2010). After estimating it would take approximately 21,000 hours of staff time to complete this project, they opted to contract with Marcive to perform this service for them. While pleased with the result of Marcive's processing, LSE librarians realized that many changes they expected processing to correct automatically would actually require manual intervention because of the limitations inherent to automatic processing, and that they "had higher expectations of the process than could be met through automation" (Williams, 2010, p. 47). LSE opted to hire a temporary staff member for 8 months to address the manual processing required for the highest priority reports. LSE also opted to subscribe to Marcive's cataloging and notifications services for ongoing authority-control processing. The result is that their catalog is more consistent and contains fewer errors than it did before implementing authority-control processing, which has improved their users' search and discovery experience (Williams, 2010).

Wolverton (2005) surveyed academic libraries in the United States to determine their authority control practices and staffing. With 193 libraries responding out of the 258 libraries at

Carnegie Doctoral/Research Extensive or Intensive institutions targeted by the survey, Wolverton collected data that builds a picture of authority-control practices at large academic libraries. He found that 50% of responding libraries performed all authority work in-house, 41% reported using a combination of in-house and outsourced authority work, and only 4% reported that they outsourced all authority work (Wolverton, 2005). Vendors used by libraries for authority work outsourcing included OCLC (34%), Library Technologies, Inc. (29%), Marcive (27%), Blackwell North America (3%), Washington Research Library Consortium (2%), Peter Ward (1%), and Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (1%) (Wolverton, 2005). With 96 libraries responding to a question about ongoing outsourcing practices, 23% reported using a vendor for a one-time cleanup, 60% reported that a vendor does ongoing reviews of new cataloging as well, and 65% reported that a vendor provides authority-record update notifications (Wolverton, 2005).

Burke and Shorten (2010) conducted a survey of 300 academic libraries to gauge whether and how institution type and collection size affect name authority work, what authority work is done, how the processes at different types of institutions are carried out, and who performs the authority work. With 99 institutions responding, representing 2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, and graduate institutions, the authors found that large libraries and graduate institutions were more likely to outsource some of their authority work, including both processing of their entire catalog as well as ongoing reviews of current cataloging and authority updates. Small- and medium-sized libraries were more likely to outsource on a one-time basis or sporadically (Burke & Shorten, 2009).

## **Methodology**

The authors designed a survey to gauge the use of vendors for authority control processing in large academic research libraries and sent it to the heads of cataloging or authority-control librarians at academic libraries that are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The authors chose SurveyMonkey software to manage the survey and responses. Deployed in February 2016, the survey remained open beyond the original deadline of March 18, 2016, until April, 2016. Altogether, 71 libraries responded to the survey; however, the authors deleted six incomplete responses from the final set of data. The 65 remaining completed surveys form the basis of the analysis.

The survey was designed to gather information about the libraries' integrated library system, their use of authority file and authority record update services, their use of vendors for authority control of current cataloging, their future plans for the use of vendors for authority control, and demographics.

## **Survey Results**

### **Profile of Responding Libraries**

Of the responding libraries, 70.77% (46 libraries) were part of public institutions and 29.23% (19 libraries) were from private institutions. Respondents reported holdings ranging from 1.5 million to 14 million titles, with an average of approximately 4.6 million and a median of approximately 3.5 million titles. Several respondents indicated their reported number of titles included consortial holdings, content from institutional repositories, and demand-driven acquisition or electronic resources records that may or may not receive authority-control processing. Responding libraries' rankings in the ARL Library Investment Index ranged from 2 to

111. Approximately one-third of respondents (21 libraries, 32.31%) either skipped the question or reported not knowing their ranking.

### **Integrated Library System**

The integrated library system (ILS) most commonly used by the responding libraries was Ex Libris' Voyager system, with 16 libraries (24.62%) reporting it as their ILS. Following Voyager, the ILSs used were Ex Libris' Alma (12 libraries), Innovative Interfaces' Sierra (11), SirsiDynix Symphony (9), Innovative Interfaces' Millennium (9), and Ex Libris' Aleph (7). One respondent each reported SirsiDynix Horizon and OCLC WorldShare Management Services. None of the responding libraries reported using the Quali Ole system. The length of time libraries reported being on their current ILS ranged from a few months to more than 25 years.

### **Authority File and Authority Record Update Service**

The authors intended the second section of the survey to provide a picture of the current practices of large academic research libraries with authority-file and authority-record maintenance. Responses to the question "Does your library maintain an authority file in its integrated library system?" indicated that 90.77% of respondents (59 libraries) do maintain an authority file. The 6 libraries that do not maintain an authority file included 1 Aleph, 3 Alma, 1 Symphony, and 1 Sierra ILS.

Table 1 illustrates that, of those libraries that maintain an authority file in their ILS, 96.67% (58 libraries) include Library of Congress name headings, 95% (57 libraries) include Library of Congress Subject Headings, 63.33% (38 libraries) include Library of Congress genre/form headings, 46.67% (28 libraries) include Medical Subject Headings, 13.33% (8 libraries) include children's headings, and 33.33% (20 libraries) include other headings. Those



headings include series, local, other form/genre headings, Canadian Subject Headings, and headings in languages other than English, such as French, Arabic, and Japanese.

The next question, answered by 62 respondents, focused on the source of authority records. Respondents were able to select or provide more than one source. Table 2 demonstrates that vendors supply authority records to 72.58% (45 libraries) of the respondents. Fifteen of the libraries at private institutions (88.33%) purchased authority records from a vendor; 30 of the libraries at public institutions (68.18%) did so. Other sources included downloading authority records individually from a bibliographic utility such as OCLC's WorldCat, which was selected by 35.48% (22 libraries); batch downloading from a bibliographic utility, selected by 6.45% (4 libraries); and purchasing authority records directly from the Library of Congress, 4.84% (3 libraries).

Six survey respondents indicated that they create authority records in-house. Three noted that Ex Libris provides authority records to its customers in Alma's Community Zone. Three libraries indicated that their consortium provided authority records in their shared catalog environment. One library responded, "We are not able to use authority records at the moment in our consortial implementation of Alma," revealing the variety of experiences of different libraries and consortia as they migrate to new integrated library systems.

Of the 45 libraries that indicated they purchase authority records from a vendor, 20 libraries (44.44%) purchased them from Backstage Library Works, 9 libraries (20%) purchased them from Peter Ward, 8 libraries (17.77%) purchased them from Marcive, and 8 libraries purchased them from LTI. One library indicated that it uses LTI for authority control but does not load the authority records because the library's discovery service, Endecca, does not make

use of authority-record data for discovery. Backstage Library Works was the preferred vendor for both public and private institutions, as 26.09% of the public institutions and 42.11% of the private institutions used them as the vendor of choice as a source for authority records.

The frequency that libraries load authority-record updates into their respective ILSs ranged from daily to annually. Table 3 shows that the most common frequency of authority record update loads was monthly, with 26 libraries (44.07%) reporting that frequency. Fourteen libraries (23.73%) load updates weekly, followed by 12 libraries (20.34%) downloading records at the point of cataloging, and 8 libraries (13.56%) loading updates quarterly. Four libraries (6.78%) load updates biannually, 3 libraries (5.08%) load daily, 3 load biweekly, and 1 library loads records annually. Some libraries also reported more than one approach, such as combining a regular load of updates with loading individual records as needed. One library indicated that the process of loading authority record updates varies from year to year and that they do not schedule regular loads.

Only 26 libraries (41.27%) indicated that they create or maintain local authority records not subsequently contributed to or included in the Library of Congress name or subject authority files. A majority of 37 libraries (58.73%) do not create or maintain local authority records. This question generated 26 comments, most of them indicating why the library continued to create local authority records: to document series decisions and to support cataloging for local and special collections, as well as theses and dissertations. A number of respondents indicated that they created local authority records in the past, but current policy precludes this practice. The ability to create authority records for the national authority file through cooperative cataloging programs such as NACO was cited by several as reasons for

ending the practice of creating local authority records; however, 2 respondents indicated that they continue to create local authority records when not enough information can be found to justify a NACO record.

In contrast, 31 libraries (48.44%) do make local additions and changes to national-level authority records in their local systems. A slight majority of 33 libraries (51.56%) do not make local additions to authority records. As with the previous question, many respondents wrote comments with most (21 libraries) indicating that they record local series decisions in the authority record, and 5 libraries indicating that they add cross-references to the authority record. Three reported adding classification numbers for literary authors. Many respondents commented to indicate that they participate in national cooperative cataloging programs and make changes to the authorized form of the record rather than locally. Nineteen of the responding libraries indicated that they code records or fields to protect the local changes from overlay during subsequent authority-record loads or updates.

### **Current Cataloging**

The authors intended the third section of the survey to gather information about how large academic libraries performed authority control or quality assessment in their current cataloging workflow. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate that, of the 62 libraries that responded, 35 libraries (56.45%) send their bibliographic records to a vendor to be processed. Of those, 22 were libraries in public institutions, representing 51.16% of the public institutions, and 13 were libraries from private institutions, representing 68.42% of the responding private institutions. Thirty-one (50%) of the libraries run reports, programs, or scripts that make corrections to bibliographic records in the ILS. Another 26 libraries (41.94%) generate reports in the ILS and

then make corrections manually, and 19 libraries (30.65%) generate reports and make corrections through batch processing.

The survey allowed respondents to select more than one option for this question, so some libraries use more than one method to keep their headings up to date. Large academic libraries use 3 primary vendors to process current cataloging records: Backstage Library Works, LTI, and Marcive. Backstage Library Works was the vendor of choice with 20 customers, more than twice as many customers in the pool of survey respondents than either of the other 2 vendors. LTI followed with 9 customers, and Marcive had 8 customers. The remaining 28 respondents indicated that they do not use a vendor to process bibliographic records for current cataloging. Of those, 2 noted that they rely on the Alma ILS and SirsiDynix, respectively, for authority-control processing. Alma has authority-control functionality as a feature, and SirsiDynix offers authorities processing as part of its suite of data services (<http://www.sirsi.com/services/data-services>). Again, Backstage Library Works was the vendor of choice for both private and public institutions, with 26.09% of the public institutions and 42.11% of the private institutions using them to process current cataloging records.

As with authority updates, the frequency most used for bibliographic record processing is monthly, with 21 libraries (32.31%) indicating that they send their records to a vendor on a monthly basis. Only a handful of libraries chose each of the other options: quarterly (4 libraries), weekly (3 libraries), daily (2 libraries), biannually (2 libraries), biweekly (1 library), and annually (1 library).

The majority of survey respondents are members of one or more cooperative cataloging initiatives. Survey options were NACO, SACO, BIBCO, CONSER, and the ECIP Cataloging program.

Respondents also had the option to list other programs. Of those provided by the survey, NACO was the most popular, with 84.23% of respondents indicating their libraries were members. Others were SACO (53.85%), BIBCO (50%), CONSER (40.38%), and the ECIP Cataloging Program (25%). Other responses included 1 library that is a member of the GPO cooperative cataloging partnership, and another that participates in an Online Audiovisual Catalogers NACO-AV Funnel Project.

Staff who support authority control functions in libraries can fall into several categories, including clerical, paraprofessional, professional/librarian, or student/hourly employees. When asked what the full time equivalent (FTE) of each category of staff worked on authority control processes, 14 respondents indicated that clerical staff ranged from 0 to 2 employees. Forty respondents indicated that paraprofessionals assigned to authority-control activities ranged from .25 to 5. One outlier who indicated 30 may not have understood what we intended by "FTE." The number of librarians dedicated to authority-control functions ranged from 0 to 6, with one outlier indicating 20. Many respondents indicated that all catalogers had responsibility for some aspects of authority control, and it was therefore difficult to quantify. The number of students or hourly workers who work on authority-control activities ranged from 0 to 1.5, with most respondents indicating less than 1 FTE.

Fewer than half of the responding libraries reported that they are able to stay current with tasks associated with authority-control processing. Of the 61 respondents to this question, 29 respondents (47.5%) indicated that they were able to stay current with authority-control tasks, and 32 (52.5%) responded that they were unable to stay current. Libraries who reported using vendor-supplied authority records and those who reported downloading records

individually from a bibliographic utility (such as OCLC Worldcat) split nearly evenly in their ability to stay current. Interestingly, of the 3 libraries that reported purchasing authority records directly from the Library of Congress or batch downloading records from a bibliographic utility, 2 were able to keep up with authority-control activities and 1 was not.

Library staff use a number of methods to submit requests for heading corrections. The survey offered options such as use of a web form, e-mail, phone, printouts, or other (in which respondents could provide their own answer). Respondents could select more than one option, so the results add up to more than 100%. According to our respondents, 28.3% use a web form, 78.3% use e-mail, 13.3% use the telephone, 41.7% send printouts, and 28.3% use other methods to report the need for heading corrections. These methods included in-person requests (5 libraries), and a problem-ticketing system (Spiceworks). Two libraries responded that such requests hardly ever happen, and 1 library reported that they had no workflow in place to request changes.

### **Future Plans**

The survey asked about respondents' intentions to change to a different integrated library system within the next 3 years. The 64 libraries that responded divided evenly between those that planned to stay with their current system and those that were making plans to migrate to a new system. Libraries using Ex Libris Voyager, Ex Libris Aleph, and Innovative Interfaces Millennium services were the most likely to anticipate migrating to another system. None of the 12 libraries using Ex Libris Alma anticipated migrating to another system in the next 3 years. Libraries using SirsiDynix Symphony and Innovative Interfaces Sierra split more evenly between migrating to a new system or not.

The survey also asked if respondents anticipated changing any aspects of their authority processing within the next 3 years. The responses were slightly more divided with 39 (60%) of the libraries expecting to make changes to their authority processing, while the other 26 (40%) did not anticipate making any changes. Reasons given for possible changes to the authority processing included anticipated changes to the functionality of the current integrated library system, moving to a new data model such as BIBFRAME, migrating to a new integrated library system, automating processes, and working in a shared authority environment.

### **Conclusion**

This study revealed that most large academic libraries maintain an authority file in their respective integrated library system. They include name, subject and MeSH headings, and many include headings from a variety of other authority files. Nearly three-quarters of them use vendors as a source of authority records; others download authority records from OCLC's WorldCat or another source, and many obtain authority records using more than one method. Several libraries noted that the Alma library services platform provides authority records in its system, pointing the way towards a potential new trend of increasingly integrated library services platforms. If this trend continues, the need for independent vendors for authority-control processing may eventually fade.

Monthly processing of both authority-file updates and current cataloging was the most common frequency. A surprisingly large number of libraries (41%) continue to maintain or create local authority records, indicating that the national authority files may not be meeting all libraries' needs. The number of libraries participating in the Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) was much higher (84%) than that found in Wolverton's 2004 study (41%)

(Wolverton, 2005). This discrepancy is likely due to the different target audiences for the respective surveys. Wolverton's survey targeted a larger group of academic libraries (258 with 189 responding), which included smaller academic libraries than this survey targeted (Wolverton, 2005). A higher percentage of ARL member libraries participate in NACO and other cooperative cataloging programs.

Another trend the survey made obvious is that the options for vendor support for authority control activities have shrunk over the past 2 decades. Wolverton's 2004 survey revealed that vendor options for some aspect of authority-control processing included Library Technologies, Inc., Marcive, OCLC/MARS, Innovative Interfaces, Inc., Blackwell North America, Peter Ward, and Washington Research Library Consortium (Wolverton, 2005). This survey shows that the vendor options have decreased, with LTI, Marcive, Peter Ward (as a source of authority records but not as an option for processing of current cataloging), and Backstage Library Works dominating the market, the latter the most preferred vendor of large academic libraries.

This study makes clear that use of vendors for authority control continues to be an important way that libraries maintain the integrity and accuracy of their online catalogs. However, nearly half of libraries responding to this survey indicated that they are still unable to stay current with tasks associated with authority control. This finding is surprising and points toward the need for more research in this area. It is possible that the eventual implementation of a new metadata communication format, such as BIBFRAME, and the widespread deployment of linked data will solve these workflow and workload challenges. It is certain that additional research in this area is warranted. Other areas that would benefit from further research include



an assessment of built-in authority-control functionality, such as that found in the Alma library services platform, and an evaluation of the reasons behind the continued use of locally created and edited authority records.

## Appendix A

### Authority Control Benchmarking Survey

The goal of this survey is to gauge current authority control practices of research libraries and to investigate whether the library's choice of integrated library system has an impact on their choice to use a vendor for authority record updates or bibliographic record authority control processing.

The survey should only take 10-15 minutes. All questions are optional and you may quit the survey at any time.

This study has been approved by the University at Albany Institutional Review Board (submission # 2747)

The survey results will be shared with the library community through a published article. If provided, the names of responding institutions will be listed in an appendix but will not be associated with specific responses in the article.

We would appreciate your participation. If you have any questions, please contact us at [rmugridge@albany.edu](mailto:rmugridge@albany.edu) or 518-442-3631.

Thank you in advance for your valuable feedback!

Rebecca L. Mugridge, Rebecca Nous, Nancy Poehlmann, Wendy West

---

---

### Authority Control Benchmarking Survey

Page 1 Integrated library system

1. What integrated library system does your library use?
  - a. Ex Libris Voyager

- b. Ex Libris Aleph
  - c. Ex Libris Alma
  - d. SirsiDynix Horizon
  - e. SirsiDynix Symphony
  - f. Innovative Interfaces Millenium
  - g. Innovative Interfaces Sierra
  - h. Kuali Ole
  - i. OCLC WorldShare Management Services
  - j. Other (please provide)
2. How many years have you been on your current integrated library system?

Page 2 Authority file and authority record update service

3. Does your library maintain an authority file in its integrated library system?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
4. If yes, does it include the following? (select all that apply)
- a. Library of Congress name headings
  - b. Library of Congress subject headings
  - c. Library of Congress genre/form terms
  - d. Medical subject headings
  - e. Children's headings
  - f. Other (please identify)
5. What is your library's source of authority records? (select all that apply)

- a. A vendor supplies them
  - b. We purchase authority records directly from the Library of Congress
  - c. We download authority records one at a time from a bibliographic utility (e.g., OCLC WorldCat)
  - d. We batch download authority records from a bibliographic utility (e.g., OCLC WorldCat)
  - e. Other (please explain)
6. If [a] selected: Which vendor does your library use as a source of authority records?
- a. Backstage Library Works
  - b. LTI
  - c. Marcive
  - d. Peter Ward
  - e. Other (please supply)
7. How frequently does your library load authority record updates?
- a. Daily
  - b. Weekly
  - c. Bi-weekly
  - d. Monthly
  - e. Quarterly
  - f. Bi-annually
  - g. Annually
  - h. Other (please supply)

8. Do your library staff create or maintain local authority records (i.e., authority records that are not contributed to or included in the Library of Congress name or subject authority files)? (please describe)
9. Do your library staff make local additions and changes to national-level authority records in your system?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
10. If yes, how do you handle updates to those national-level records? (please explain)

Page 3 Current cataloging

11. How does your library maintain the authorized forms of name and subject headings in bibliographic records in your integrated library system? (select all that apply)
  - a. We send our records to a vendor to be corrected and returned to us
  - b. We run reports, programs, or scripts that make the corrections within the integrated library system
  - c. We generate reports and then make the corrections through batch processing
  - d. We generate reports and then make corrections manually
  - e. Other (please explain)
12. If [a] selected: Which vendor does your library use for authority control?
  - a. Backstage Library Works
  - b. LTI
  - c. Marcive
  - d. Other

13. If you use a vendor to maintain the authorized forms of name and subject headings in the integrated library system, how often do you send the vendor records for processing?

- a. Daily
- b. Weekly
- c. Bi-weekly
- d. Monthly
- e. Quarterly
- f. Bi-annually
- g. Annually
- h. Other (please supply)

14. Is your library a member of any of these cooperative cataloging initiatives? (select all that apply):

- a. NACO
- b. SACO
- c. BIBCO
- d. CONSER
- e. ECIP Cataloging Partnership

15. How many staff support authority control functions? Please express in FTE (Full Time Equivalent; for example if 50% of a clerical position is responsible for authority control functions, write .5 in the box below)

- a. Clerical
- b. Paraprofessional

- c. Librarian
  - d. Hourly employees (including students)
16. Is your library able to stay current with tasks associated with authority control processing?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
17. How do library staff submit requests for heading corrections? (select all that apply)
- a. Web form
  - b. E-mail
  - c. Phone
  - d. Print outs
  - e. Other (please identify)

Page 4 Future plans

18. Do you anticipate migrating to a different integrated library system within the next 3 years?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
19. Do you anticipate changing any aspect of your authority processing in the next 3 years?  
(please explain)
- a. Yes
  - b. No

Page 5 Demographics

20. Name of institution

21. My institution is:

- a. Public
- b. Private

22. How many titles are in your library's integrated library system?

23. What is your library's rank in the ARL Library Investment Index (2012-2013)?

Page 6 Additional questions

24. If your authority control procedures are available on the web, please indicate the URL here:

25. May we contact you with follow-up questions?

- a. Yes
- b. No



### References

- Aschmann, A. (2002). The lowdown on automated vendor supplied authority control. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 20(3).
- Burke, S.K., & Shorten, J. (2010). Name authority work today: A comparison of types of academic libraries. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 54(1).
- Lam, V.-T. (2001). Outsourcing authority control: Experience of the University of Saskatchewan Libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 32(4).
- Tsui, S.L., & Hinders, C.F. (1999). Cost-effectiveness and benefits of outsourcing authority control. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(4).
- Vellucci, S.L. (2004). Commercial services for providing authority control: Outsourcing the process. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 39(1-2).
- Williams, H. (2010). Cleaning up the catalogue. *Library & Information Update*, 9(1).
- Wolverton, R. (2005). Authority control in academic libraries in the United States: A survey. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 41(1).
- Zhu, L., & Von Seggern, M. (2005). Vendor-supplied authority control: Some realistic expectations. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 23(2).