



NACO Reviewers Handbook For OCLC Connexion

Created by the Cooperative Cataloging Section
Library of Congress

2011

Topics to be Covered in this Handbook

Welcome!

What do Reviewees Already Know?

As you and your reviewee enter into the NACO review phase, what does the reviewee already know about what lies ahead?

What to Look for in Reviewing NACO Records

Focus on the areas in name authority records of importance to NACO work

Examples for Reviewing

A simple NACO record
A more difficult NACO record
A complex NACO record

Contacts

How to find help and additional resources

NACO Reviewer's Things to Remember

NACO Reviewer's Tracking Sheet

Welcome!

Thank you for volunteering to become a NACO Reviewer! As the NACO Program grows and expands internationally, the volume of new authority records contributed by members increases exponentially. Training and review have always been a hallmark of the NACO Program, and by agreeing to become a NACO Reviewer, you are playing a critical role in the function and well-being of the NACO Program.

This handbook is meant to serve as a reference source as you begin your work as a reviewer. The handbook is also meant to be used in conjunction with the online training for NACO Reviewers created and conducted by the Cooperative Programs Section at the Library of Congress.

Please review the information in this handbook thoroughly before and after taking the online training. We hope that you will refer to this handbook many times in the future as your review skills develop.

Best wishes,

Cooperative Programs Section
February 2011

What do Reviewees Already Know?

Review guidelines and procedures are stressed in the NACO training workshop.

What are reviewees told about the review process?

- NACO independence must be achieved before direct contribution to OCLC
- A NACO reviewer will be assigned locally or regionally, or LC will review
- The review period is flexible, based on number of records submitted
- Create NAR and submit to review file
- Notify reviewer by email; include OCLC symbol in the message
- Ask brief questions or cite rules in the 952 of the record; otherwise use email for questions
- Send both easy and tough records, no more than 10-15 at a time
- Make corrections based on reviewer's comments before submitting new records for review

- Avoid overloading email messages with multiple problems
- Send a representative range of records (language, level of difficulty)
- Reviewer is looking for no more than 10% error rate in areas that affect access
- The basic mechanics of submitting a NAR for review using Connexion
- 24-hour rule: access points in any record that has been in a local save file for over 24 hours must be re-searched before adding to the online review file
- 24-hour rule: a reviewer may request that access points in any record that has been in the review file for over 24 hours be re-searched before contribution to the LC/NACO Authority File
- Reporting to LC Cooperative Programs Section
- Independent NACO libraries handle their own review and quality control
- Libraries must contact LC Cooperative Programs Section (naco@loc.gov) with NAR delete requests:
 - Tell Coop which one to keep, which one to delete, and include LCCNs (not OCLC ARNs)

- Certain categories of BFM must be reported to LC Cooperative Programs Section (naco@loc.gov)
- Include LCCNs (not OCLC record numbers) for LC BFM

What to Look for in Reviewing NACO Records

All records will have an 008 Fixed Fields array

The 008 Fixed Fields of importance to NACO:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Rec stat | n | Entered | 19911022 | Replaced | 20100921072759.0 |
| Type | z | Upd status | a | Enc lvl | n |
| Roman | ■ | Ref status | a | Mod rec | |
| Govt agn | ■ | Auth status | a | Subj | a |
| Series | n | Auth/ref | a | Geo subd | n |
| Ser num | n | Name | a | Subdiv to | n |
| | | | | Source | |
| | | | | Name use | a |
| | | | | Subj use | a |
| | | | | Ser use | b |
| | | | | Rules | c |

The highlighted fields are the ones to watch for:

Upd status (008/31)

Ref status (008/29)

Auth status (008/33)

Name (008/32)

Source (008/39) – should be machine supplied

Rules (008/10) – probably in the reviewee's template

Variable data fields

The Variable data fields of importance to NACO:

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 010 | | n.2010040679 |
| 040 | | DLC #b eng #c DLC |
| 100 | 1 | Hayes, Sophia B. #q (Sophia Birchard), #d 1792-1866 |
| 400 | 1 | Birchard, Sophia, #d 1792-1866 |
| 670 | | NUJCMC data from Rutherford B. Hayes Presidential Center for Civil War letters of Lucy Webb Hayes, 1861-1866 #b (Sophia B. Hayes) |
| 670 | | Thomas Holcombe genealogy page online, Jun. 22, 2010 #b (Sophia Birchard, b. 15 Apr. 1792, d. 30 Oct. 1866, mother of President Rutherford Birchard Hayes) |

The highlighted fields are the ones that every record must have:

An 010 (machine supplied— remember that this field will not show up when a record is in Connexion for review)

The 010 will be added when the record is contributed to the NAF

Every record will have a 1XX heading

Every record will have at least one 670. It is often the 670 that causes the most difficulty for new NACO trainees

Please check the 670 fields very closely

A mistake in a 670 will often carry over into other access-related parts of the record

Variable data fields—“as needed”

The “As needed” variable data fields of importance to NACO:

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 010 | | n 2006172883 |
| 040 | | DLC #b eng #c DLC #d DLC |
| 110 | 2 | Coos Valley Railroad Company |
| 410 | 2 | Coos Valley Railroad Company of Vermont |
| 510 | 2 | Maine Central Railroad Company |
| 670 | | NUJCMC data from Maine Historical Society for Its Records, 1890-1931 #b (Coos Valley Railroad Company, headquartered in St. Johnsbury, VT) |
| 670 | | NUJCMC data from Maine Historical Society for Records of the Upper Coos Railroad Company, 1890-1932 #b (Coos Valley Railroad Company of Vermont was chartered in 1882 and was sold to the Maine Central Railroad Company in 1932) |

A 4XX and 5XX are needed in this record

Remember that there must be a separate authority record for the 5XX entity

Variable data fields—“as needed”

The “As needed” variable data fields of importance to NACO:

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 010 | | n 2002091621 |
| 040 | | DLC #b eng #c DLC |
| 100 | 1 | Smith, Zachary |
| 667 | | Cannot identify with: Smith, Zachary A. (Zachary Alden), 1953- (n 84191476) |
| 670 | | His The official legends of wrestling, c2001: #b t.p. verso (Zachary Smith) |

667 note: consult DCM Z 1 667 for examples and formatting

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 010 | | n 91065923 |
| 040 | | DLC #b eng #c DLC |
| 110 | 2 | Hungarian Astronautic Society |
| 670 | | COSPAR Colloquium (2nd : 1990 : Sopron, Hungary). The environmental model of Mars, 1991. #b p. facing tp. (The Hungarian Astronautic Society) |
| 675 | | Telefon, Telex, Teletax, 1993. #a Magy. nemz. bibl., 1993, Index. |

675 field– watch for indicators that one is needed

An undifferentiated personal name NAR should have a 675, a corporate NAR should have one if the heading is in an unexpected language, etc.

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 010 | | n 80008258 |
| 040 | | DLC #b eng #c DLC #d DLC #d IEN #d OCoLC |
| 034 | | #d W0684640 #e W0684640 #f N0444804 #g N0444804 #2 geonames |
| 043 | | n-us-me |
| 151 | | Bangor (Me.) |
| 451 | | Bangor, Me. #w nnaa |
| 670 | | GeoNames, algorithmically matched, 2009 #b (ppt; 44°48′04″N 068°46′40″W) |
| 781 | 0 | #z Maine #z Bangor |

034 fields (as of 2009), 043 fields, and 781 fields may be added by NACO participants for geographic names. The 034 field is a new one– even NACO reviewers might need to consult DCM Z1 for guidance.

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 010 | | no2002007298 |
| 040 | | IAhCCS #b eng #c IAhCCS #d DLC |
| 053 | 0 | PS3606.A36 |
| 100 | 1 | Fairbanks, Nancy, #d 1934- |
| 500 | 1 | Herndon, Nancy, #d 1934- #w nnnn |
| 663 | | Works by this author are entered under the name used in the item. For a listing of other names used by this author, search also under #b Herndon, Nancy, 1934- |
| 670 | | Truffled feathers, 2001. #b t.p. (Nancy Fairbanks) t.p. verso (Nancy Herndon) p. 3 of cover (Nancy Fairbanks is a pseudonym for Nancy Herndon, author of the Elena Jarvis mystery series for Berkley Prime Crime, historical romances written under the name Elizabeth Chadwick; r. El Paso, Tex.) |
| 670 | | Contemp. authors online, May 7, 2001 #b (Nancy Herndon; b. May 29, 1934, St. Louis, Mo.; romance and mystery novelist; uses pseudonym Elizabeth Chadwick; r. El Paso, Tex.) |

An 053 may be added for a literary author— but in order to add this to a new NAR, be sure that the NACO reviewee has applied to LC for the correct number

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/053/053prop.html>

Summary: There is a ranking in what to look for. Obviously the 1XX field is of critical importance, as well as a correctly-formatted 670 field as justification. But are some errors more critical than others? Think about access. It helps to mention to a reviewee that a certain type of error is not as critical as another type. That helps to build confidence and solidifies the reviewer-reviewee relationship.

Although the NACO reviewee already knows about the “24-hour rule,” it is advisable to discuss this during the outset of the review process, since understanding the authority distribution cycle lessens the possibility of contributing a duplicate record.

As a NACO reviewer, you also may want to notify your reviewee that you intend to search “behind” him or her—meaning that you intend to perform the same searches to be sure that every relevant authority heading, authority reference, or bibliographic record (potential BFM) was identified.

Examples for Reviewing -- 1

| Rec stat | n | Entered | 20101109 | Replaced | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---|
| Type | z | Upd status | a | Enc lvl | n |
| Roman | ■ | Ref status | n 1 | Mod rec | |
| Govt agn | ■ | Auth status | a | Subj | a |
| Series | n | Auth/ref | a | Geo subd | n |
| Ser num | n | Name | a | Subdiv tp | n |
| Source | c | Name use | a | Subj use | a |
| Ser use | b | Rules | c | | |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 040 | | MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 |
| 100 | 1 | Dannerslee, Jerome D. 2 4 |
| 400 | 1 | Dannerslee, Jerome Dennis 5 |
| 670 | | Faith in hard times, 2010: #b t.p. (Jerome D. Dannerslee) p. 4 of cover (Jerome Dennis Dannerslee) |

3

Reviewer submits this personal name NAR.

You notice a couple of things right away

- 1) There is a reference but Ref status is “n” (bad)
- 2) Reviewer chose the correct form of heading (good) and formatted a good 670 but
- 3) did not add fuller form in the heading (bad but not a major error for a beginner) and also you note that the reference is not really necessary according to primary elements and LCRI 26.2.

What is a good response?

“This NAR looks good— you made a very good choice on the heading, based on the two forms presented in the item. Don’t forget about AACR2 and LCRI 22.18, though. You know that the D. in the heading represents Dennis, so according to the RI you should add that to the heading in a \$q:

100 1 Dannerslee, Jerome D. \$q (Jerome Dennis)
 Did you know that the reference is optional according to LCRI 26.2? See the primary elements concept in the RI. If you leave the reference, be sure to code Ref. status “a.”
 Great job on this one– please add it to the NAF once you make the changes.”

Examples for Reviewing -- 2

| Rec stat | n | Entered | 20101109 | Replaced | | | |
|----------|---|-------------|----------|-----------|---|----------|---|
| Type | z | Upd status | a | Enc. lvl | n | Source | c |
| Roman | ■ | Ret status | a | Mod rec | ■ | Name use | a |
| Govt agn | ■ | Auth status | a | Subj | a | Subj use | a |
| Series | n | Auth/ref | a | Geo subd | n | Ser use | b |
| Ser num | n | Name | a | Subdiv to | n | Rules | c |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 040 | | MARC21 #b eng #c MARC21 |
| 100 | 1 | Creighton, Elise 1 |
| 400 | 1 | Thornton, Elise Creighton 4 |
| 670 | | Reflections, 2010: #b tp. (Elise Creighton Thornton) 2 3 |
| 670 | | OCLC, Nov. 9, 2010 #b (hdg.: Creighton, Elise; Creighton Thornton, Elise; usage: Elise Creighton; Elise Creighton Thornton) |

Reviewee submits this personal name NAR.

It is a good job, but there are some things that are not clear. The reviewee searched OCLC, and did a good job also of citing what was found there. Is this a case of AACR2 22.3A1 where the reviewee found that the usage Elise Creighton was the commonly found form and chose that as the heading, or could this be a name change by marriage to Elise Creighton Thornton, and instead AACR2 22.2C1 applies? It is not clear. The reviewee seems

to have thought it through, though. So this is a good record with a complicated twist.

What is a good response?

“Great job on this one— it is a true test of the NACO rules. You are applying good insight and it shows. You did an excellent job with the OCLC citation. It looks to me like you identified a commonly found form of name Elise Creighton. Remember, if you could not identify a commonly found form according to AACR2 22.3A1, you would have gone with the latest form (probably Elise Creighton Thornton, based on the publication date of the work you have in hand), or the fullest form (also Elise Creighton Thornton). But did you consider that this may be a name change (by marriage) according to AACR2 22.2C1? Please think about this and let me know what your thought process was and what you think of my question.”

Examples for Reviewing – 3

| Rec stat | n | Entered | 20101109 | Replaced | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------|----------|-----------|------|----------|----------|---|
| Type | z | Upd status | a | Enc lvl | n | Source | c | |
| Roman | ■ | Ref status | a | Mod rec | | Name use | a | |
| Govt agn | ■ | Auth status | a | 1 | Subj | a | Subj use | a |
| Series | n | Auth/ref | a | Geo subd | n | Ser use | b | |
| Ser num | n | Name | n | Subdiv tp | n | Rules | c | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|------------------|
| 040 | | MARC | 2 | #b eng #c MARC21 |
| 110 | 2 | Czech institute of Astronomy | | |
| 410 | 1 | 4 | Czechoslovakia. #b Institute of Astronomy | 3 |
| 670 | | Studies in astrophysics, 2009: #b t.p. (Czech Institute of Astronomy) | | |

| | |
|---|------|
| 5 | 675? |
|---|------|

Reviewee submits this corporate name NAR.

A lot is going on here. You see the heading in English for a non-English-country body. Should it be established in Czech? Did the reviewee code this one provisional to indicate that the language of the heading is not the correct language? You notice some other things: the word “institute” is lower-cased in the heading– a typo? There is a reference through Czechoslovakia indicating this is a government body– no indication of that in the record, though. And why Czechoslovakia and not Czech Republic for an item published in 2009? No 675 indicating that an attempt was made to identify a Czech form for the heading?

Is this an appropriate response?

“This is not a good job. You should wait to submit headings for corporate names until you have done a better job with personal names. I don’t know why you set this up in English? Did you look for a form in Czech? You should remember from training that this is one case where research is required. The reference is not correct, either. Why did you use Czechoslovakia? Is this really a government body? You did not show that. Reread the rules on Government bodies. Didn’t Czechoslovakia cease to exist in the 1990s? This is a 2009 publication! This record needs a lot of work. Please start over and resubmit it after you answer all the questions I asked. Oh, and did you read the rules on capitalization for corporate names in English?”

How could this response be improved?

Contacts

Knowing when to ask for help is more important than knowing where to go for help.

You may need to ask for help in a lot of situations. This happens to all of us. Situations such as:

- 1) Lack of language expertise – your reviewee submits a record in a language you do not know. What do you do? Wing it? Do your best with what you have?
- 2) Lack of experience in a given category of authority records – not everyone is strong in all categories of NACO. Some persons prefer personal names, others, corporate or geographic names. For others, it may be uniform titles. If you feel out of your league as a reviewer, it is not a mark against you. It happens to all of us. You may need to ask for help.
- 3) Work overload affecting NACO review – also can happen very easily. You start off on a good note with your reviewee, things are rolling along at a good pace, then you are pulled for a special project. Your timeliness in review starts to falter. It is not a strike against you to work out another arrangement, hopefully in the short term only. Where do you turn if this happens?
- 4) Bad reviewer-reviewee relationship – this is what we all hope will never happen, but it can. For whatever reason, you and your reviewee are just not making the best of the

situation. Is it wrong to ask for a reassignment? Where do you go for help?

- LC Cooperative Programs NACO staff

LC Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov) is always able to help, or at least lend a sympathetic ear– NACO review workflow issues, putting you in touch with someone with necessary language expertise, BFM questions, NAR delete questions, PCC listserv questions, further training questions, etc.

- Local NACO colleagues

Your local NACO colleagues may be a good support, too, especially with the language issues.

- PCC Trainers listserv

Veteran NACO trainers read and reply to the PCC Trainers listserv (PCCTRNG@LISTSERV.LOC.GOV). LC Coop Section adds reviewers' names to the PCCtrng@loc.gov discussion list-- that's where you'll see info about the trainers' meeting at ALA, in addition to its listing on the PCC calendar.

- ALA PCC Trainers' Meetings

Held on the Friday of the ALA weekend, generally at 4:00 PM. A good venue to meet and greet other NACO trainers and run things by them.

- NACO Training Manuals

The NACO Workshop Manual that your reviewee used might help, too. The training materials have changed over time, so each trainee uses a slightly modified version.

- NACO Participants' Manual

As a last resort, the NACO Participants' Manual might give you the answer you need. That document is under revision right now, however (November 2010).

NACO Reviewer: Things to Remember

- Review records submitted by reviewees in a timely manner
- Remember the 1XX and 670 fields are of critical importance—examine those thoroughly
- Look for errors in all areas of access and fixed fields
- Perform the same bibliographic and authority searches as the reviewee, especially at the beginning of the review process (often termed “searching behind the reviewee”)
- Emphasize the “24-hour rule” in searching and contributing records
- Review, if possible, a variety of records before considering NACO independence
- Try to start a response to a reviewee with the “good” point(s); then bring out the “bad” point(s)
- Always supply the rule (AACR2, LCRI, DCM, etc.) to each situation, where possible
- Cite rules clearly and specifically, especially in the beginning stages of review
- Always track and document the reviewee’s progress

- Instill the correct BFM reporting method before and after independence
- If your workload affects your NACO review—ask for help from Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov)
- Notify Coop NACO staff (naco@loc.gov) when an institution is ready for NACO independence
- Once the reviewer recommends NACO independence, the reviewee may start to contribute directly to the LC/NACO Authority File
- A formal notification letter will be sent from PCC/Coop to the institution, but the reviewee does not need to wait for this letter to be received before starting independent contribution to the LC/NACO Authority File
- Remember, reviewees are looking to the reviewer for guidance and direction toward NACO independence

NACO Reviewer's Tracking Sheet

The form on the next page can be used by a NACO Reviewer to track the progress of the Reviewee.

Please remember that once NACO independence is recommended, the NACO Reviewer will be asked to submit to LC's Coop Section an approximate figure representing the total number of records reviewed. This figure will be included in the formal "notification of independence" letter that will be sent by Coop to the institution.

This Tracking Sheet is intended for the NACO Reviewer's personal use, not necessarily to be shared with the Reviewee.

The form will allow the Reviewer to keep a count of the number and types of NARs submitted for review, and to keep general statistics on the types of errors and on areas where improvement takes place.

There also is an Excel spread sheet that can be used for tracking purposes. That document is included in the materials sent to you before the webinar; if you need a copy of this document, send a request to naco@loc.gov.

