CAROL F. ISHIMOTO

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: Its Impact on University Libraries

The Library of Congress National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging has been in operation since 1966. It seemed timely to conduct a fact-finding study to examine the effects of this program on the organization of bibliographic activities in a selected group of university libraries. This report will attempt to prove that the program has had a significant impact on these libraries. With budget cuts experienced by most libraries in recent years, there is no doubt that this program has contributed a great deal towards reducing cataloging costs and increasing bibliographic compatibility with the Library of Congress.

IN 1964 THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES (ARL), in its efforts to reduce the amount of original cataloging performed by research libraries, passed a resolution which would give high priority to developing a program of centralized cataloging. This led to the formation of the ARL Shared Cataloging Committee with William S. Dix, university librarian, Princeton University, as chairman.[1] The committee's proposal, in consultation with the Library of Congress (LC), resulted in the formation of the Library of Congress National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC), commonly referred to as the Shared Cataloging and Regional Acquisitions Program, and authorized

Ms. Ishimoto is senior cataloger, Harvard College library. This study was conducted in the fall 1971, under the auspices of the Council on Library Resources Fellowship Program. The author extends her thanks to all who helped in the survey.

by Title II, Part C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. According to the text of the Act, funds would be transferred to LC from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for acquiring currently published library materials throughout the world of value to scholarship, and for providing and distributing bibliographic data in the form of printed catalog cards, or by other means, promptly after receipt of these materials. It was the hope of ARL and LC that NPAC would accomplish speedier bibliographic control of increasing acquisitions into research libraries by sharing the bibliographic information from the national bibliographies, and thus would reduce cataloging costs by eliminating the unnecessary duplication of libraries cataloging the same work a number of times.

In September 1966, John W. Cronin, then director of the processing department of the Library of Congress, issued his first progress report on the Title

II-C Shared Cataloging Program. In it he reported that sixty-eight libraries had agreed to participate in the program and that the LC depository sets were being sent to these libraries. At that time the first overseas LC control center established in London for current British imprints was fully operational. Today, nearly six years later, NPAC coverage includes the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, German Federal Republic, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Rumania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USSR, and Yugoslavia. In addition to these shared cataloging countries, NPAC Regional Acquisitions Centers exist in Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei), East Africa, and Brazil. There are presently eighty-three participating libraries receiving the Title II depository sets from LC. Clearly, NPAC is one of the most ambitious and important federally supported programs undertaken by the Library of Congress.

A fact-finding study of the effects of NPAC on the organization of bibliographic activities in a selected group of university libraries was made by this writer in the fall of 1971. Thirteen large libraries of institutions founded in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with one exception, were visited. The eighteenth century institutions were Yale, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, Columbia, and the University of North Carolina; those established in the nineteenth century were the University of Michigan, University of Toronto, Indiana University, Cornell, University of California (Berkeley), Stanford, and the University of Chicago; and the only twentieth century institution was the University of California at Los Angeles. There is no correlation between the age of the insti-

tution and the size of its library, with the exception of Yale, which is the oldest (1701) and also the largest (5.5 million volumes).

This report is limited to the central research collections of these libraries and any departmental libraries for which cataloging is centralized. The first part will discuss some effects of NPAC on the administration of technical services departments; it will then describe the systems of deferred cataloging used to optimize the utilization of the depository sets received from LC; the third part will analyze the percentage figures for materials cataloged with NPAC/LC copy and those which are cataloged originally. The concluding portion of this report will be an evaluation of NPAC, its future implications, and current trends in the development of parallel programs by several of these libraries.

THE EFFECTS OF NPAC ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TECHNICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENTS

With the beginning of NPAC, technical services administrators for the most part began thinking in terms of restructuring their departments in order to capitalize on the economic advantage of using nonprofessionals for cataloging with LC copy. Toronto was the only library that had an LC cataloging unit in operation since the early 1960s; for the American libraries this was not a conversion that could be made immediately, since it meant a gradual phasing from professional to nonprofessional. Today the majority of these libraries have LC cataloging sections staffed with nonprofessionals, with a high caliber nonprofessional or professional in charge. Those libraries not having a separate LC unit still employ nonprofessionals for cataloging with LC copy.

It is difficult to quote figures as to how much NPAC has saved in dollars. It is

interesting to note that Princeton, for instance, has not hired a professional cataloger in six years, but the number of nonprofessional catalogers has increased from two in 1966 to eight in 1971 due to the increase in the number of NPAC/LC cards available. At Indiana the number of "junior" catalogers increased from five to ten during the same period with some of the professional positions converted to nonprofessional posts. At Cornell in 1964 only one nonprofessional existed in their catalog department; in seven years seven professional positions have been converted to nonprofessional posts. In 1966/67 the staff of the catalog department at Yale was equally divided between professionals and nonprofessionals; today the ratio is one third professional and two thirds nonprofessional. During the fiscal year 1970/71 Yale converted two senior professional positions to two nonprofessional posts in subject cataloging; two nonprofessional posts held by college graduates in descriptive cataloging were replaced by two high school graduates. The actual savings due to these conversions amounted to $15,000, to cite a specific figure.

In order to expedite processing with LC copy and to take advantage of the increase in the number of NPAC/LC cards, four libraries have adopted the LC classification schedules since 1966: Yale (1969), Pennsylvania (1967), Columbia (1966), North Carolina (1966). Others adopted LC earlier: Stanford (1965), Toronto (1959), Cornell (1949). Berkeley and Michigan adopted LC in the 1920s, but their collections have not been totally reclassified. UCLA, Chicago, and Indiana are totally classified by LC. Princeton, as of 1971, has adopted several classes of the LC schedules and further expansion will be explored.

The libraries which have adopted the LC classification schedules in recent years have not attempted to reclassify their entire collections. Yale and Pennsylvania, for instance, have limited their reclassification to their reference collections. Shelving books in the stacks by two different classification schemes has not presented undue public service problems. It should be pointed out that these libraries have reorganized their stacks in order to bring corresponding subjects together as much as possible on a given floor. Closing off the "old" classification schemes meant that books in those areas could be shelved in compact storage fashion. Browsers appear to have adjusted to browsing in two different areas. This is not to suggest that problems do not arise; the important issue is that some administrators were willing to take a long range point of view in adopting the LC classification schemes, regardless of the size of their collections, in order to conform as much as possible with LC, which in turn would result in a reduction of cataloging costs. For some, however, such a decision could only be interpreted as being made at the expense of the readers and users of the libraries.

Time and cost figures for cataloging with NPAC/LC cards versus original cataloging were not readily available. In two of the largest libraries it is estimated that titles with LC copy require about half the amount of time to catalog than those without. At another library the ratio seemed to be three titles with LC copy to one title cataloged originally. Mrs. Helen Tuttle, assistant university librarian for preparations at Princeton, made a time and cost study based on descriptive cataloging only, excluding subject analysis. The results indicate that in descriptive cataloging salary costs, roughly six titles with LC copy are equivalent to the cost of one original title. In her time study for titles cataloged descriptively only, approximately four titles with LC copy could be processed for each original title. Ralph Johnson, assistant head of technical ser-

vices at UCLA, reported that cataloging by nonprofessional LC copy catalogers averages twenty minutes per title, while original cataloging by professional catalogers averages forty-five minutes per title. To illustrate the time saved in man hours, Mr. Johnson pointed out that in 1970 at least 50 percent of the LC cards, or approximately 10,500 titles, retrieved from the depository file were actual NPAC titles. He stated that based on the above figures, LC copy catalogers would catalog these 10,500 NPAC titles in 3,500 hours while the professional catalogers would require 7,708 hours, had original cataloging been required. This is a time saving of 4,208 man hours. Mr. Ritvars Bregzis, associate librarian for systems and technical services at the University of Toronto, made a salary cost study for LC copy cataloging versus original cataloging in 1968/69. His figures included descriptive cataloging, subject analysis, and classification. The results indicate that at Toronto the cost of original cataloging is nearly four times greater than LC copy cataloging.

The advantages of conforming to LC as much as possible, and reducing cataloging costs by doing so, have encouraged technical services administrators to adopt a flexible attitude toward the delays which continue to exist in the distribution of NPAC data.

DEFERRED CATALOGING FOR OPTIMIZING THE UTILIZATION OF THE DEPOSITORY FILE

Before discussing how some of these libraries are trying to improve the utilization of the depository file it might be appropriate to discuss the maintenance of the depository file itself. For some libraries, the maintenance of the depository file has presented budgetary and space problems. When the NPAC cards began arriving many of the libraries receiving the depository sets

from LC did not anticipate the notable increase in the amount of filing that would be created and therefore did not adequately provide for this in their budgets. Also, with the steady increase in the number of cards received from LC, the need for additional catalog cases and the space to locate them have led some administrators to the decision of maintaining temporary depository files, sorting out certain categories of cards either to be distributed to other locations, or discarded, and keeping the others received for the current year and either one, two, or four previous years. Yale, Michigan, and Berkeley appear to be the only libraries that have continued to maintain the original depository files, although they have all started supplementary files due to the growth of their catalogs. Four of the libraries have maintained their depository files, excluding certain categories, since the beginning of NPAC, but due to space problems may decide to weed their files once the LC Quinquennial Catalog (1968–1972) is published. Cornell and Chicago do not maintain depository files, but have instead integrated their depository cards immediately into their selection activities. Only those NPAC/LC cards for which books are ordered, anticipated on approval/blanket order plans, or which represent works being received on standing orders for monographic series are retained. Chicago, however, maintains a cross-reference file; Cornell keeps a selective group of references which includes history and information cards and cross-references for the Hebrew, South Asian, and East Asian classes.

It may be of some interest to note here some of the categories that libraries discard from the depository sets as they are received from LC: phonodiscs, filmstrips, motion pictures, maps, music, juvenile literature, revised cards, and those specific subjects and languages that do not fall within the collecting

policies of the libraries. Cross-references represented a category discarded by several libraries, but LC is now able to handle them as a separate unit in the distribution of cards to the NPAC participants so those libraries have been given the opportunity of eliminating the receipt of these cards.

There is increasing discussion today on the part of those libraries maintaining temporary files that a title arrangement is preferable to a main entry approach. Their position is that a title arrangement of the depository file would result in more successful matches, since there are fewer variables with titles than with the main entry approach. The University of North Carolina is one of the libraries that keeps a temporary file and in 1969 it made the decision to rearrange the depository file to a title arrangement. If LC were to discontinue the arrangement of the depository sets by main entry, those libraries maintaining a permanent file, which also serves as an authority file, would find this arrangement very unsatisfactory.

In order to optimize the utilization of NPAC/LC cards, the majority of the libraries have developed systematic deferred cataloging procedures for current materials with imprint dates for the current year and generally two previous years. The waiting period for NPAC/LC copy ranges from six months to an unlimited period of time, but usually not exceeding two years as a maximum. Waiting for LC copy is justified for two basic reasons: (1) cataloging costs are reduced, and (2) bibliographic compatibility with LC is achieved. Seven libraries file copies of their order slips in their depository files for works which are likely candidates for NPAC/LC copy and hopefully a match is eventually made between the book and the LC copy.

For libraries participating in the various PL480 programs the books are generally held indefinitely for the LC/ PL480 cards to arrive. The alternative is to process these materials from the bibliographic information on the PL480 slips included with the shipment of books, or from the bibliographic data recorded in the corresponding accessions lists.

While deferred cataloging is in effect at a majority of these libraries, service to readers has not been curtailed. Uncataloged materials are made available in a variety of ways. Yale has an "In Process List" on film and Cornell has a "Status List" which is a computer-produced printout, both of which list materials on order as well as received, and the location of the uncataloged materials. Michigan, in 1964, established a procedure called "Temporary One Entry" (TOE) whereby copies of the computer-produced order fanfolds are filed in the public and depository catalogs. The books are shelved in the stacks by accession number and are available for circulation. Michigan's entries are reviewed by a professional cataloger at the time the books are received and any necessary changes of entry are noted on the order fanfolds before the slips are filed in the two catalogs. When the NPAC/LC cards are received the books are recalled from TOE for standard cataloging. UCLA, in 1968/69, developed a system patterned after Michigan's TOE, but in lieu of filing order slips into the public catalog, a computer-produced printout of TOE titles, arranged by author entry, is updated every two weeks in the form of a catalog supplement. TOE candidates include "notifies" and reserve books. The entries used in the catalog supplement are those established at the time of preorder searching, so presumably no additional time is spent on reviewing the entries. For several years Berkeley has had a system of deferred cataloging termed "Temporary Cataloging Pool" (TCP) which makes possible the circulation of uncataloged materials. At the present time, Berkeley is ex-

perimenting with extending TCP to branch library materials which are cataloged centrally at the General Library. Copies of the order slip are filed both in the depository file and the author/title catalog for TCP materials; temporary records are sent to the branch libraries.

In 1970/71 Chicago established a circulating "W" class for uncataloged materials while waiting for NPAC/LC copy. The letter "W" was used because it represented a letter not used in the LC classification schedules. Therefore, "W" plus the accessions number constitutes the call number for these books. Earlier in this report Chicago was mentioned as one of the libraries that does not maintain a separate depository file; however, those NPAC/LC cards selected by the book selectors either to be ordered or to be saved are filed into an Outstanding Order File (OOF) which is arranged by title. Since selection is by no means limited to titles found on NPAC/LC cards, the establishment of the circulating "W" class has been a step forward in service and has practically eliminated rush cataloging of these current titles for readers. Copies of the order slips for these uncataloged books are filed by a title arrangement in a supplementary file at the end of the general catalog. This system appears to be one of the least expensive means of making uncataloged materials available; books which are candidates for this class are on the shelves ready for circulation on the third day after arrival in the library.

Of all the deferred cataloging systems used by these libraries, the most personalized public service system is that developed by Princeton called "Reader Liaison Service." The service, which was started in 1968, is given by a nonprofessional of high caliber who is a member of the order division of the preparations department. Order slips filed in the public catalog give instructions to the reader to consult the order division for information regarding the availability of the title. When books are received at Princeton and NPAC/LC copy is not immediately available for them, the books are arranged by date received and shelved by order number in a "hold area." A control file arranged by order number is stamped by date received and this is the key to locating uncataloged materials. An important result of this service is the elimination of most of the rush cataloging, including reserve books, which are also circulated on an uncataloged basis. The major difference between Princeton's system of deferred cataloging and the four other systems described above is that Princeton's uncataloged books are not shelved in the open stacks, but are shelved within the working area of the preparations department. In order to charge out an uncataloged book the order number serves as the call number and the book is simply stamped inside the cover showing marks of ownership and the statement to return the book to the order division. This system eliminates the temporary preparation of the books for the stacks. A procedure has been developed to circulate uncataloged monographs to branch libraries as well. This service costs Princeton the salary of one nonprofessional, but with an average monthly circulation of 457 titles in 1970/71, one can assume that this is quite a successful approach to making uncataloged materials available while waiting for LC copy.

It is important that libraries have a systematic reviewing process in order to prevent the development of large, uncontrollable backlogs. Two obvious disadvantages of temporary records are that books are handled twice, however slight the first processing represents, and additional filing of temporary records is required during the interim of waiting for LC copy. An inconvenience which sometimes arises from circulating

uncataloged books is the need for recalling or locating books when the NPAC/LC cards arrive in the libraries. As long as deferred cataloging continues, it is necessary that a thorough analysis of the costs involved with temporary processing be made periodically to insure that costs are being kept to a minimum.

MATERIALS CATALOGED WITH NPAC/LC COPY AND ORIGINALLY

No distinction is made by these libraries between materials cataloged with NPAC copy from those cataloged with regular LC copy. Therefore, it is virtually impossible to measure the extent of NPAC cards used by these libraries; however, most of these libraries have kept statistics since the beginning of NPAC for materials cataloged with LC copy in general, which includes shared cataloging cards and regular LC cards. (See Table 1.) In presenting cataloging production figures and the percentages of works cataloged with LC copy by these libraries, the following factors must be kept in mind: (1) the priorities of the libraries; (2) the size of the cataloging staff and the number of hours spent on cataloging; (3) whether there is a cataloging backlog and the size of it; (4) the extent of area programs, special collections, and collecting policies which do not fall within the scope of NPAC; (5) the extent of deferred cataloging; and (6) the lack of standardization in the content of cataloging statistics.

The investigation revealed that there are still types of materials that require original cataloging. Certain categories appear to lend themselves to original cataloging on a somewhat continuing basis: (1) rare books; (2) retrospective materials; (3) specialized subject and language collections; (4) the institution's theses and foreign dissertations, excluding trade editions; (5) technical reports; (6) selective pamphlet materials; (7) microforms; and (8) the specific priorities of the libraries to meet the needs of their university communities.

East Asian materials represented a specialized area which was common to all thirteen institutions. In spite of the fact that NPAC coverage has included Japan since 1968, many of these libraries felt that although the percentage of NPAC/LC copy has increased for works in the Japanese language, the coverage was not yet up to their expectations. The real problem, however, seems to be with Chinese materials for which a considerable amount of original cataloging is being done by these libraries because there is no program equivalent to NPAC for China. Since the cultural revolution in mainland China in 1966, new current publications have practically ceased to exist.[2] In view of the recent developments between China and the United States perhaps there is some possibility that this new relationship may encourage the establishment of a program similar to NPAC, not limiting itself to current acquisitions, but extending the program to include retrospective materials dating back to 1949 or earlier.

In 1970/71 Princeton reported that out of a total of 4,119 Chinese titles cataloged, only 20 percent of these titles were cataloged with LC copy; for Japanese titles, 36 percent out of 1,795 titles were cataloged with NPAC/LC cards. In 1969/70 Yale performed an analysis of cataloging and time statistics and for East Asian materials, the average number of titles cataloged per month was 85.7 with 23.4 percent cataloged with LC cards.

Robert Vosper, university librarian of UCLA, questioned the wisdom of continuing to classify Chinese and Japanese materials with the classic Harvard Yenching scheme. His point is well taken since these materials are becoming in-

TABLE 1

Library	New Titles Cataloged 1966/67	1970/71	Percent of LC Copy 1966/67	1970/71
Toronto	50,683	80,263	56	52[1]
Stanford	42,097	60,119	—	53 (approx.)
Yale	59,826	74,056[2]	40	53
Indiana	55,537	63,196	36	54
Cornell	85,155	75,883	43	57[3]
Pennsylvania	25,380[4]	35,984[4]	—	60[4]
UCLA	48,489	55,143	49	64[5]
Berkeley	38,901	53,513	49	70[6]
Columbia	55,443	61,141	53	70[7]
Chicago	56,719	57,049[8]	57	70[8]
Michigan	49,394	59,096	67	70[9]
North Carolina	——	47,399[10]	—	75[10]
Princeton	39,649	59,282	41	80[11]

1. This lower figure is due to an increase in coverage of materials in the non-roman alphabet and retrospective works.
2. In 1969/70 when Yale adopted the LC classification and subject headings were already revised to conform to LC, the count of new titles hit a new high of 76,451. In 1970/71, if Southeast and East Asian materials were excluded from the count, the percentage of LC copy would have risen to 63. Yale has established a system of priorities in cataloging and only current imprints falling within a certain priority are held for LC cards.
3. Cornell has a holding period of at least ten months for monographs in series. At the end of ten months, approximately 70 percent can be matched with NPAC/LC cards.
4. Does not include serials or rare books cataloged within the Central Library. Current books are held

six to eight months for LC copy.
5. Figure reflects deferred cataloging (TOE).
6. Figure reflects deferred cataloging (TCP).
7. Current materials are held for about eight months before the first search.
8. In 1970 the Regenstein Library opened; there was also a reduction in staff by 6.3 percent. Production figures for the two previous years were: 1968/69, 67,686 titles; 1969/70, 67,487 titles. The LC figure for 1970/71 reflects the deferred cataloging system.
9. Both LC figures reflect Michigan's TOE system of deferred cataloging.
10. This figure was lower than previous years due to staff turnover. The figure includes LC adaptive cataloging.
11. Figure reflects deferred cataloging, and includes cataloging derived from LC.

creasingly multidisciplinary in character and the time may have therefore arrived to adopt the LC classification. Furthermore, if an NPAC type of program were ever developed for China, it would be highly advantageous to adopt LC in order to reduce classification costs for Chinese as well as Japanese materials.

Materials from Spain and Portugal were reported by these libraries as areas requiring original cataloging. Spain has since been incorporated into NPAC so current Spanish imprints for 1971/72 are now covered. However, due to the unfortunate delay of its national bibliography, Portugal remains outside the scope of NPAC, although LC does supply some copy for works with Portuguese imprints.

Serials continue to require a substantial amount of original cataloging. Although LC has been giving U.S. serials

higher priority than previously, a number of librarians expressed the need for NPAC coverage of foreign serials, at least on a selective basis. Perhaps this suggestion is somewhat more reasonable today since LC has adopted the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules for cataloging serials.

Documents, including foreign, international, and national, appeared to be an important class of materials which required a considerable amount of original cataloging. Although LC is giving a higher cataloging priority to U.S. federal and state documents, the coverage is on a selective basis. The libraries would benefit a great deal if more documents were processed by LC, since documents are frequently difficult and time-consuming for the individual libraries to catalog. The end result would be advantageous in that libraries would

achieve greater bibliographic compatibility with LC.

It is doubtful that original cataloging will ever cease entirely in large university libraries because of the nature of their collections and the communities they serve. However, it is reasonable to assume that with the increase in availability of LC copy, the number of original cataloging personnel can be gradually decreased, with personnel limited to those with special language and/or subject expertise. The important question is at what point LC copy has achieved the ideal percentage figure for research libraries in general. One would expect that the percentage figure should be higher for smaller and medium sized research libraries than for large research libraries with collections of over two million volumes. Of course, thoughts and opinions would vary widely on this question, and there is undoubtedly more than one answer. It would seem that a reasonable ideal LC copy availability figure for large research libraries would be in the vicinity of 70–75 percent, with a limited amount of deferred cataloging.

THE EVALUATION OF NPAC AND ITS FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

Research libraries owe a great deal to the Association of Research Libraries and to the Library of Congress for the foresight and action taken in the development of the Shared Cataloging Program. If NPAC receives sufficient funds to extend its coverage and the speed of its operations, the availability of cataloging copy will be increased, and therefore greater bibliographic compatibility will be attained. This in turn should prove to be a significant contribution toward the eventual goal of an automated national data base.

Without NPAC, virtually no major academic research library, in view of the tight budgetary situation in recent years, could have continued to maintain present levels of bibliographic control. Although NPAC has not been able to produce cataloging copy within three to four weeks upon receipt of the titles at LC as was originally planned when the program was developed, libraries have for the most part adjusted their technical operations to the delays in order to optimize the utilization of NPAC/LC cards. It is encouraging to learn that the delays in card distribution to NPAC participants are not due to backlogs in the Shared Cataloging Division at LC, but to delays in the card production unit of the Government Printing Office (GPO). According to a recent statement made by LC, foreign language titles required ten to eleven weeks to be printed at GPO in April 1971; but in January 1972, this had been reduced to three to four weeks.[3]

NPAC cards have been valuable to book selectors in the acquisition of current materials. Preorder searching has benefited from NPAC cards because entries can be verified at the time of ordering and this information passed on when the materials are received for processing. It can be said that NPAC has contributed to the realization that the activities of acquisitions and cataloging are interrelated and that the information recorded at the time a book is ordered should be as bibliographically correct as possible so that the same information can be used at the cataloging stage, eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort.

It was encouraging to observe that the majority of the libraries studied were accepting the descriptive, subject, and classification information on NPAC/LC cards as much as possible, except in cases of actual error.[4] Experienced catalogers, however, expressed concern over the lack of standardization of bibliographic description on NPAC cards. When NPAC began, catalogers were en-

couraged to adopt a flexible attitude and accept the variations in bibliographic description as given in the various foreign national bibliographies. As the years go on, there is no doubt that greater uniformity is desirable, as variations could lead to problems in the identification of publications.

At the International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts in Copenhagen in 1969, discussions were held regarding the development of an International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) which would include bibliographic data required for catalog cards, national bibliographies, and book orders.[5] A proposed draft standard of the ISBD was presented at the meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) in 1971. If the proposed ISBD is adopted at the international level, libraries will not only benefit from the bibliographic standardization of NPAC cards, but they can look forward to a future expansion of the MARC program to include foreign language materials in a standard bibliographic format.

A parallel program of NPAC for U.S. publications is Cataloging in Publication (CIP). This deserves inclusion in this report because of its tremendous potential with 157 American publishers participating as of January 1972. Libraries receiving the LC depository set will have the option of converting the Library of Congress CIP data appearing in the book to catalog copy if the printed card has not been received, or subscribers to MARC will be able to extract the bibliographic data from the MARC tapes since CIP books appear on MARC four to six months before the books appear on the market. Eventually, U.S. government documents will be included in CIP. It is interesting to note that there are two cataloging in publication programs in existence today at the international level. Brazil began its program

in July 1971 and the National Central Library, Taipei, Taiwan, began its project with four publishers in September 1971.[6]

At the time this study was conducted, automation programs for computer-produced catalog cards were at varying stages of planning and development at several libraries. These programs could be considered parallel or supplementary to the LC depository file. Chicago was the only library with an operational computer-based technical processing system, utilizing MARC tapes and data from NPAC/non-MARC LC cards, as well as materials cataloged originally in the roman alphabet for the computer-produced sets of catalog cards. Toronto began its MARC Service in 1970; there was some question, however, as to whether this service would be continued, due to the relatively low level of use. When LC expands the data input of MARC to include foreign titles from NPAC, this service would become more useful and economically attractive. Columbia was about to begin its computer-based cataloging system with the utilization of MARC tapes. If appropriate funds could be obtained, Stanford was ready to begin Phase I of its on-line automated network system which would be the implementation of MARC. Berkeley (together with the San Diego and Santa Cruz campuses) is planning a pilot project which would not only include the utilization of MARC tapes, but would input data from NPAC/non-MARC LC cards, as well as original cataloging. The key question is what the time and cost figures will be for computer-produced card sets as opposed to manually-produced sets. One of the important features of this pilot project is that it would provide input for the University of California Book Catalog Supplement. As of early 1972, Pennsylvania was expecting to gain access to the MARC records stored in the Ohio Col-

lege Library Center (OCLC) through an on-line, cathode-ray-tube computer terminal.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1972 NPAC funds were appropriated directly to the Library of Congress instead of being transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. According to LC this direct appropriation helps to insure the continuity of NPAC. On the whole, the Library of Congress has done a com-

mendable job of operating a program of the magnitude and complexity of NPAC. The participating libraries, in the spirit of cooperation, should record meaningful facts and statistics, to be reported annually, which would give the Library of Congress the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. This in turn would give the Library of Congress the type of support it needs for budget justifications in order to continue the further expansion of such a significant program as NPAC.

REFERENCES

1. William S. Dix, "Centralized Cataloging and University Libraries—Title II, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965," *Library Trends* 16:97–111 (July 1967).
2. *National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging. Progress Report, No. 8* (April 1969).
3. Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries, *Service Proposals for the Library of Congress* (Rev. Feb. 1972) (Unpublished).
4. In 1968 Yale began to revise its subject headings in order to conform to LC. The changeover took one and a half years and it is estimated that 30 percent of the headings were changed. The PZ (Fiction) class is not used by the majority of these libraries

using the LC scheme because they prefer to classify the works falling within this class with the literature of the country. Certain exceptions exist with the Z (Bibliography) class, as some libraries prefer to classify bibliographies with the subjects.
5. "International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts, Copenhagen, 1969," *Libri* 20, no. 1, p. 105–32; Dorothy Anderson, "International Standards in Cataloguing," *International Library Review* 3:241–49 (1971).
6. Library of Congress, Processing Department, *CIP Progress Report No. 1* (Jan. 1972); *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* 31, no. 7 (Feb. 17, 1972), p. 74.