

# Map Cataloguing Survey 2004 Report

By Alberta Auringer Wood  
 Memorial University of Newfoundland

In mid-March of this year, a survey regarding map cataloguing was distributed via the CARTA Listserv by me and to the TSIG-L Listserv by one of my cataloguer colleagues here at Memorial, Elizabeth Browne, and it was posted on the ACMLA website, as well. It is included as Appendix A to this report of the analysis of it. This survey was the result of several months of deliberations and exchanges of information among a number of members of the ACMLA Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) - Trudy Bodak (Chair of the BCC), Frank Williams, and Grace Welch - along with Emilie Lowenberg, Chief of the Union Catalogue Division of the National Library of Canada (now Library and Archives Canada). Their input is much appreciated. There were 40 responses as of July 2004 from libraries across the country when analysis was undertaken. The determination of library type was based on information external to the information gathered by the survey. The library respondents include 23 Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) members, 11 other university libraries, one college library, one public library, and four government agency libraries, including the Library and Archives of Canada. Unfortunately, no other archival institutions are included. University libraries predominated in the survey respondents, making up 85 percent of the total respondents. The entire list of respondents is given in Appendix B. Their participation is certainly appreciated by myself and the committee.

**Institution Type**

	Numbers	Percent
<b>CARL Member</b>	23	57.5
<b>Other University Library</b>	11	27.5
<b>College Library</b>	1	2.5
<b>Public Library</b>	1	2.5
<b>Government Agency</b>	4	10.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 1**

The survey responses were entered into SPSS for tabulation and analysis of the results. This report presents the results of that analysis. For example, 80 percent (32) of the libraries reported that catalogued maps are included in the main library catalogue while 20 percent (8) reported that they were not. The distribution by the type of institution is noted in the table below based upon question three.

**Maps in Main Library Catalogue**

Institution Type	Yes	No	Total
<b>CARL Member</b>	19	4	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	10	1	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	2	2	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 2**

The sizes of map collections reported ranged from three maps to over two million maps. This is shown in the following table in grouped categories, though the information was gathered in question four as a distinct number from each institution. The Library and Archives of Canada was the largest of the map collections, not too surprisingly.

**Number of Maps in Collection by Institution Type**

Institution Type						
Number of maps in collection	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
No Answer	2	2	0	0	1	5
0-10,000	1	2	1	1	1	6
10,001-35,000	1	4	0	0	1	6
35,001-95,000	6	2	0	0	0	8
95,001-190,000	10	1	0	0	0	11
190,001-2,060,000	3	0	0	0	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 3**

The largest category of numbers of maps catalogued was in the range of 0 – 1,000 as is shown in the next table. Half of those who answered this question (number 4A) had 10,000 or more maps catalogued. The survey did not track numbers of titles, but rather numbers of maps.

**Number of Maps Catalogued by Institution Type**

Institution Type						
Number of maps catalogued	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
No Answer	2	1	0	0	1	4
0-1,000	1	7	1	1	1	11
1,001-10,000	5	2	0	0	0	7
10,001-20,000	6	0	0	0	1	7
20,001-95,000	5	1	0	0	0	6
95,001-229,000	4	0	0	0	1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 4**

There was quite a bit of variation in terms of derived versus original records, but 20 libraries reported deriving 50% or more of their catalogue records and 10 noted that more than 70% of their map cataloguing were original records. This included six libraries where 90-100% of their cataloguing was the creation of original records. Of this group, there were four CARL libraries. On the other hand, nine of the CARL libraries did only 10-29% original cataloguing. Perhaps, this is an indication of the usefulness and time saving of the original cataloguing for this larger group. One quarter of libraries

either did not know what the comparison between original and copy cataloguing was or did not answer the question (numbers 4B & 4C and number 15).

**Percent of Original vs. Copy Cataloguing by Institution Type**

Institution Type						
Percent of original vs. copy cataloguing	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
90-100%	2	3	0	0	1	6
80-89%	2	0	0	0	0	2
70-79%	1	0	0	0	1	2
60-69%	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-59%	2	1	0	0	1	4
40-49%	1	2	0	0	0	3
30-39%	1	0	0	0	0	1
20-29%	5	0	0	0	0	5
10-19%	4	1	0	0	0	5
0-9%	0	1	1	0	0	2
Do Not Know	4	3	0	0	0	7
No Answer	1	0	0	1	1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 5**

Some of the details of the numbers of original map records are given in Table 6 (from question number 4B), while those for derived map records are in Table 7 (from question number 4C). The breakdown is also by type of institution. Nearly 30% of respondents to the survey did not answer this question, but among the 73% who did respond the majority of them (62%) had created less than 9,000 original map records, while the remaining 38% created more than that.

**Number of Original Map Records by Institution Type**

Institution Type						
Number of original map records	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
No Answer	7	3	0	0	1	11
0-100	2	3	1	1	1	8
101-1,800	2	3	0	0	0	5
1,801-9,000	5	0	0	0	0	5
9,001-25,000	4	1	0	0	1	6
25,001-222,000	3	1	0	0	1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 6**

Similarly, 30% did not answer the question regarding the numbers of derived records. Of the 75% who did respond, most derived 6,000 or fewer records (80%), with the remaining 20% using more than that.

**Number of Derived or Copy records by Institution Type**

Institution Type						
Number of derived or copy records	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
No Answer	7	2	0	0	1	10
0-100	3	5	0	1	1	10
101-825	2	3	1	0	0	6
826-6,000	6	0	0	0	2	8
6,001-31,350	2	1	0	0	0	3
31,351-204,000	3	0	0	0	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 7

AACR2 was the cataloguing rule of choice for 35 libraries, while three libraries indicated that they did not use it and two did not answer the question. RAD and an “in house” scheme were other rules reported. This information is based upon question number five and is tabled below.

**Cataloguing Rules are AACR2**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	35	87.5
No	3	7.5
No Answer	2	5.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 8

**Other Rules Used**

	Frequency	Percent
RAD	1	2.5
In house	1	2.5
No Answer	38	95.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 9

There was quite a bit of variation in terms of classification scheme use, with the majority of libraries (34 or 85%) reporting use of the Library of Congress (LC) classification. Only one used Dewey while 10 (25%) indicated various other classification schemes were in use, such as Boggs and Lewis, which 5 CARL libraries reported using. As can be seen in the table below prepared from question number six, some libraries used a number of classification schemes resulting in a higher number of responses than the number of libraries who responded.

### Classification Schemes by Institution Type

Institution Type						
Classification Scheme	CARL Member	Other University Library	College Library	Public Library	Government Agency	Total
LC	20	9	1	0	4	34
Dewey	1	0	0	0	0	1
Boggs-Lewis	5	0	0	0	0	5
Roll number	1	0	0	0	0	1
U of T Class G	2	0	0	0	0	2
SNRC	0	1	0	0	0	1
In house	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>45</b>

**Table 10**

Most libraries (34 or 85%) noted doing full records with the CARL member libraries having the largest number following by other university libraries, the college library, and all the government libraries. This is reported below and based upon question number seven.

### Institution Type by Full cataloguing

Full cataloguing					
Institution Type	Yes	No	No Answer	Partial	Total
CARL Member	21	1	0	1	23
Other University Library	8	0	2	1	11
College Library	1	0	0	0	1
Public Library	0	0	0	1	1
Government Agency	4	0	0	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 11**

33 (or 82.5%) of the reporting map libraries used LC subject headings, with the largest group being CARL member map libraries with 19 or 47.5% followed by other university map libraries with 9 or 22.5%. All the government map collections that responded make use of LC subject headings as did the only college library that responded. The following table shows this and is based upon question eight.

**Institution Type by LC Subject Headings Used**

<b>LC Subject Headings Used</b>				
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	19	4	0	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	9	0	2	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	4	0	0	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 12**

Eight of the responding libraries indicated the use of other types of subject headings in response to the same question (number eight). Two university libraries use the Canadian Subject Headings (CSH), three institutions use French versions of the Library of Congress subject headings (LCSH), a government agency library uses FDC, while another government agency uses Precis, and one CARL library has developed their own subject headings. This is represented in the following table.

**Institution Type by Other Subject Headings Used**

<b>Other Subject Headings Used</b>							
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>CSH</b>	<b>French LCSH</b>	<b>FDC</b>	<b>In house</b>	<b>Precis</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	1	2	0	1	0	19	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	1	0	0	0	0	10	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	0	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	0	1	1	0	1	1	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 13**

Some sort of control of the authorities was used by all the libraries with 25 reporting in question number nine that it is automatic while 15 reported it was manual. A number of libraries reported use of both an automated and a manual authority control. The following two tables give the details on the results of this question.

**Institution Type by Automatic Subject Authority Control**

<b>Automatic Subject Authority</b>				
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	15	6	2	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	6	2	3	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	3	1	0	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 14**

**Institution Type by Manual Subject Authority Control**

<b>Manual Subject Authority Control</b>				
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	9	4	10	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	5	2	4	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	1	1	2	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 15**

Interestingly, more than half of the libraries (23 or 57.5%) responded that their records were reported to the Union Catalogue (AMICUS) while 17 (42.5%) indicated that they were not. Nearly 90% of those sending their map catalogue records to AMICUS are university libraries. These are the other details below and all compiled from question number 10.

**Institution Type by Holdings Reported to AMICUS**

<b>Holdings Reported to AMICUS</b>			
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	14	9	<b>23</b>
<b>Other University Library</b>	6	5	<b>11</b>
<b>College Library</b>	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Library</b>	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Government Agency</b>	2	2	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 16**

The most common reason for not reporting was lack of staff to do it followed by lack of time to do it. A number of institutions had multiple reasons for not reporting which resulted in the tabular information shown in Table 17 below based upon responses to question number 11. Of the non-reporting group, six (15%) indicated a wish in their response to question number 12 to be contacted by someone from AMICUS. Those institution names, as well as a contact name, have been sent on to an appropriate person at the Union Catalogue office.

**Institution Type and Reasons for Not Reporting to AMICUS**

<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Lack Staff</b>	<b>Lack time</b>	<b>Lack Expertise</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	7	5	3
<b>Other University Library</b>	1	2	0
<b>College Library</b>	0	0	0
<b>Public Library</b>	0	0	0
<b>Government Agency</b>	2	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>

**Table 17**

The questions (numbers 13 and 14) about who did the cataloguing were not well formulated to get answers easily tabulated. They asked who did original and who did copy cataloguing rather than offering categories of choices. The responses submitted by survey respondents varied but included terms such as librarian, map librarian, library technician, library assistant, map library technician, map library assistant, or cataloguing staff. With this, the compiler grouped the responses as shown below in Table 18, and, it is possible to determine that 20 (50%) libraries reported either librarians or map librarians did original cataloguing, while 10 (25%) indicated that it was done by a library technician or assistant or map library technician or assistant. There were 6 (15%) libraries who were not specific as to whether it was librarians or technicians who did the original cataloguing, but simply noted that it was cataloguing staff. 21(52.5%) institutions reported that library or map library technicians did copy or derived cataloguing. In many cases, there were librarians and technicians doing both tasks. The details are given in Table 18 below.

**Who Does Original or Copy Cataloguing**

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Copy</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Librarian</b>	11	27.5	3	7.5
<b>Map librarian or cataloguer</b>	9	22.5	4	10.0
<b>Library technician or assistant</b>	6	15.0	14	35.0
<b>Map library technician or assistant</b>	4	10.0	7	17.5
<b>Cataloguing staff</b>	6	15.0	7	17.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>87.5</b>
<b>No Response</b>	4	10.0	5	12.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 18**



Many libraries (30 or 75%) used AMICUS for a source of their cataloguing copy, while 23 (57.5%) used OCLC. Numerous libraries reported use of other sources, such as AG Canada which had 9 (22.5%). The rest of the sources cited as derived from question 16 are given in Table 19 below.

**Institution Type and Source of Copy**

Source of Copy										
Institution Type	AMICUS	OCLC	Book-where	Z39.50	AG Canada	LC Maps	Other Univ.	Ohio-Link	MUN & Melvyl	No Answer
CARL Member	17	18	1	1	7	3	1	0	1	9
Other University Library	8	4	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	5
College Library	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Library	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Government Agency	4	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>

**Table 19**

It was somewhat discouraging as a result of questions 17 and 18 to find that a slight majority (22 or 55%) of respondents were unaware of the Map Cataloguing Section or its parts of the ACMLA site and that a distinct majority (34 or 85%) did not use it or any of its parts. However, 18 or 45% of respondents were familiar with it, though only 12.5% of them actually used it. Perhaps, not having the web site address in the survey document was a hindrance to this aspect. As a result, the web address is given in Appendix C of this report.

**Familiarity With and Use of ACMLA Web Site**

	Familiar with ACMLA web site	Percent	Use ACMLA web site	Percent
Yes	18	45.0	5	12.5
No	22	55.0	34	85.0
No Answer	0	0.0	1	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 20**

Between 20% and 45% of respondents to questions 17 indicated a familiarity with cataloguing helper parts of the ACMLA web site as shown in Table 21 below. The highest familiarity was to the LC schedule for atlases page at 45% with the *Map Cataloguing Manual* page close behind at 40%. The numbers that indicated use of these pages in response to question 18 were lower, however, ranging from 10% to 20% with numbers shown below in Table 22. In the case of usage, the *Map Cataloguing Manual* with 20% was ahead of the schedule for atlases page with 17.5%. Several people indicated using the paper versions of some of these items.

**Familiarity with Parts of ACMLA Web Site**

	<b>Core Level Cataloguing</b>	<b>LC G schedule for atlases</b>	<b>Reports &amp; Documents</b>	<b>Links to web resources</b>	<b>Map Cataloguing Manual</b>	<b>MARC 21</b>
<b>Yes</b>	11	18	8	12	16	16
<b>No</b>	16	9	19	15	10	11
<b>No Answer</b>	13	13	13	13	14	13
<b>Total</b>	40	40	40	40	40	40

**Table 21**

**Use Cataloguing Helper Parts of ACMLA Web Site**

	<b>Core Level Cataloguing</b>	<b>LC G schedule for atlases</b>	<b>Reports &amp; Documents</b>	<b>Links to web resources</b>	<b>Map Cataloguing Manual</b>	<b>MARC 21</b>
<b>Yes</b>	4	7	5	5	8	7
<b>No</b>	18	15	17	17	14	14
<b>No Answer</b>	18	18	18	18	18	19
<b>Total</b>	40	40	40	40	40	40

**Table 22**

The situation was similar regarding other Map Cataloguing web pages, though more respondents (32.5%) to questions 19 and 20 used them than used the ACMLA pages, though fewer were familiar with them (35%) than those familiar with the ACMLA pages (45%).

**Familiarity With and Use of Other Map Cataloguing Helper Sites**

	<b>Familiar with Other web sites</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Use Other web sites</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Yes</b>	14	35.0	13	32.5
<b>No</b>	20	50.0	24	60.0
<b>No Answer</b>	6	15.0	3	7.5
<b>Total</b>	40	100.0	40	100.0

**Table 23**

The other map cataloguing helper site that was used most was that of the Western Association of Map Libraries and Archives (WAML) with 22.5%, while Memorial University's (MUN) Map Library Cataloguing Helpers web page had 20%, ALA (American Library Association) MAGERT's (Map and Geography Round Table) web page had 10%, the OCU (Ontario Council of University Libraries) Map Group had 15%, while LIBER Cart (Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche Groupe des Cartothécaires de LIBER) had 5% as noted numerically in Table 24 below. These web site addresses are also given in Appendix C. In anticipation of the British Cartographic Society's Map Curators Group launching a cataloguing helper site, I have included a web site address for them, too.

**Other Map Cataloguing Helper Sites Used**

	WAML	MUN	ALA MAGERT	OCUL Map Group	LIBER Cart
<b>Yes</b>	9	8	4	6	2
<b>No</b>	19	20	23	22	26
<b>No Answer</b>	12	12	13	12	12
<b>Total</b>	40	40	40	40	40

**Table 24**

Fewer respondents to question 21 (11 or 27.5%) had training in the past five years in map cataloguing than those who had not had it (29 or 72.5%). This is one of the questions that everyone answered with one institution noting one person had training while the other had not. The CARL libraries were predominant in having had training in the past 5 years with 82% or 9 of those who had training being in those institutions.

**Training in Map Cataloguing in Past 5 Years by Institution Type**

<b>Had training in map cataloguing in past 5 years</b>			
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	9	14	23
<b>Other University Library</b>	1	10	11
<b>College Library</b>	0	1	1
<b>Public Library</b>	0	1	1
<b>Government Agency</b>	1	3	4
<b>Total</b>	11	29	40

**Table 25**

Most of those who had training had received it either in house one on one (30%) or at a national workshop (25%). In house workshops (17.5%) and regional workshops (12.5%) were considerably less usual forms of training. The figures on these results from question 22 are shown in Table 26.

**Types of Training**

	<b>In house workshops</b>	<b>In house one on one</b>	<b>Regional workshops</b>	<b>National workshops</b>
<b>Yes</b>	7	12	5	10
<b>No</b>	21	15	22	21
<b>No Answer</b>	12	13	13	9
<b>Total</b>	40	40	40	40

**Table 26**

A significant majority of respondents (34 or 85%) indicated that there were cataloguing areas where they would like to have additional training in responding to question number 23. The details are shown in Tables 27. The specific topics were listed in question number 24 and the numbers interested in them are reported in Table 28.

**Institution Type and Interest in Additional Training in Cataloguing**

<b>Interest in additional training in cataloguing</b>				
<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CARL Member</b>	19	3	1	23
<b>Other University Library</b>	9	2	0	11
<b>College Library</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Public Library</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Government Agency</b>	4	0	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 27

**Topics of Interest for Cataloguing Workshops**

<b>Cataloguing Topic</b>	<b>Numbers Interested</b>
<b>Metadata for geospatial digital data</b>	27
<b>Digital data cataloguing</b>	25
<b>Authorities</b>	11
<b>Coding of fixed fields</b>	13
<b>Coding of variable fields</b>	11
<b>Main entry</b>	12
<b>Imprint</b>	8
<b>Physical description</b>	12
<b>Subject headings</b>	12
<b>Other subject headings</b>	8
<b>Finding sources of copy for cataloguing</b>	12
<b>Using sources of copy for cataloguing</b>	9
<b>Series</b>	14
<b>Classification and Cuttering</b>	1
<b>Multi-level</b>	1
<b>Early maps</b>	1

Table 28

Highest on the list of topics of interest for a cataloguing workshop as shown in Table 28 above was metadata for geospatial digital data with 27 or 67.5%, followed closely by digital data cataloguing at 25 or 62.5%. Also generating a higher amount of interest were the topics of series, coding of fixed fields,

and finding sources of copy for cataloguing, with authorities, coding of variable fields, main entry, physical description, and subject headings right behind. In single digits was interest in imprint, other subject headings, using sources of copy for cataloguing, and other (classification, cutter numbering, multi-level techniques, historic and ms. map cataloguing. It presents solid ideas for the Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) to use in planning on future cataloguing workshops.

Most respondents were not creating metadata for geospatial data (32 or 80%), but six (15%) were and two (5%) did not answer this question (number 27). All those creating metadata were in university libraries.

**Creating Metadata by Institution Type**

Institution Type	Creating metadata			Total
	Yes	No	No Answer	
CARL Member	5	16	2	23
Other University Library	1	10	0	11
College Library	0	1	0	1
Public Library	0	1	0	1
Government Agency	0	4	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 29**

A significantly greater number of people would be able to attend a workshop in their region (34 or 85%) than at a national conference (24 or 60%). However, a workshop at a national conference was of interest to a majority of respondents. Most people preferred a one (25 or 62.5%) or two (22 or 55%) day event, though 10 (25%) did choose three days. Only two people indicated an interest in a week-long workshop. This information gleaned from questions number 25 and 26 is show below in Table 30.

**Attend Workshops**

	Regional	National	One day	Two day	Three day	Week
<b>Yes</b>	34	24	25	22	10	2
<b>No</b>	4	12	5	5	15	19
<b>No Answer</b>	2	4	10	13	15	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>

**Table 30**

There were quite a few other comments either regarding map cataloguing in general or about why they were not creating metadata. Some of these were:

- Very helpful to get the information on web sites which have cataloguing information. For example, I'd never heard that we're supposed to use two 007s for remote-sensing images, one for the "map" and one for the "remote sensing" aspect.

- Our electronics cataloguer does the cataloguing for digital data as well as for geospatial data. No printed maps are catalogued. However, all atlases have full cataloguing. We have a work station for GIS Data and have all of our data listed there. But it's happening so fast we have a difficult time keeping up. We have full cataloguing for our CD-ROMS.

- Thanks for making me aware of places to go for on-line help when questions come to me for review and classification.
- Of about 180 items which could be categorized as maps or chiefly maps, 170 are atlases and treated as books for cataloguing purposes at [name removed].
- My map cataloguing skills are essentially self taught.
- Funding to attend a workshop is an issue.
- [Cataloguing is] never good enough for patrons to find maps. Need and use 535 fields and extra 651, 650 fields; I would love to see more courses offered on map libraries, map collections in general, and map cataloguing in Library Technician or MLIS programs across Canada. Additionally, it may be worth considering on-line courses in map cataloguing, rather than traditional workshop formats.
- Actually, we have a small map collection and there are zero maps catalogued. But we want in the near future to begin to catalogue them. We are depository for all NRCan and some other maps of our region.
- Training would be most welcome as this map and aerial photo collection are both new areas to both of us.
- We very much appreciate being able to make use of derived records and support any effort to ensure that records are created to meet current cataloguing standards.
- Help! Desperately needed here.

The overall conclusions from this survey are that cataloguing of maps is a growing activity in Canadian libraries and that additional training is desired for those working in the area. Public libraries have not yet become active map cataloguing institutions. Archives were not polled. Their rules are somewhat different, but their activities are of interest to the BCC. Follow-up by holding workshops both on a national or regional level, as well as other types of training or education in map cataloguing will be a focus for the BCC. It is planned to have a cataloguing workshop at the 2005 conference in St. John's, for example.

August 24, 2004

# APPENDIX A

The Bibliographic Control Committee of the ACMLA is seeking information on interest in map cataloguing and training in it, as well as the status of map cataloguing in Canada. To this end, the following survey has been prepared. Please fill in and return to [awood@mun.ca](mailto:awood@mun.ca) as soon as possible before April 16. There should be only one form per institution. People should circle as many questions as appropriate, and they should answer as much as they can.

## ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN MAP LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL COMMITTEE

### CATALOGUING SURVEY 2004

#### PLEASE FILL IN OR MARK AS NOTED.

1. Name and address of institution
2. Name and address of person filling out the form
3. Are maps in your library catalogued?
  - A. In the main library catalogue? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. In a separate catalogue? (Mark one) Yes No
4. How many maps are in your collection?
  - A. How many are catalogued?
  - B. How many are original catalogue records?
  - C. How many are derived or copy catalogued records?
5. What cataloguing rules do you use?
  - A. AACR2? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Other (please name it)?
6. What classification system do you use?
  - A. LC? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Dewey? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. Other (please name it)?
7. What is the level of cataloguing?
  - A. Full (main/added entries, descriptive, subject analysis, classification)?  
(Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Partial (please name fields used)?
8. What is used for subject heading creation?
  - A. LCSH? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Other (please name it)?
9. Are these subjects controlled by an authority of some kind?
  - A. Is it automatic? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Is it manual? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. Other (please name it)?
10. Are you reporting your map holdings to the Union Catalogue (AMICUS)?  
(Mark one) Yes No

11. If not, why not?
- A. Lack of staff to do it? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Lack of time to do it? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. Lack of expertise to do it? (Mark one) Yes No
  - D. Other (please name it)?
12. Would you like someone from the Union Catalogue (AMICUS) to contact you about reporting? (Mark one) Yes No
13. Who does original cataloguing of your maps?
14. Who does copy cataloguing of your maps?
15. What is the approximate ratio of original vs. derived map cataloguing performed in your institution? (please indicate it)
16. What sources do you use to derive copy cataloguing information?
- A. AMICUS? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. OCLC? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. Other (please name it)?
17. Are you familiar with the Map Cataloguing section of the ACMLA web site? (Mark one) Yes No  
or the following parts?
- A. Core Level Cataloguing for Non-serial Cartographic Materials? Yes No
  - B. Library of Congress G Schedule for Atlases? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS page? (Mark one) Yes No
  - D. LINKS TO WEB RESOURCES page? (Mark one) Yes No
  - E. Map Cataloguing Manual? (Mark one) Yes No
  - F. MARC 21? (Mark one) Yes No
18. Do you use the Map Cataloguing section of the ACMLA web site? (Mark one) Yes No  
or the following parts?
- A. Core Level Cataloguing for Non-serial Cartographic Materials? Yes No
  - B. Library of Congress G Schedule for Atlases? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS page? (Mark one) Yes No
  - D. LINKS TO WEB RESOURCES page? (Mark one) Yes No
  - E. Map Cataloguing Manual? (Mark one) Yes No
  - F. MARC 21? (Mark one) Yes No
19. Are you familiar with other Map Cataloguing Helper Pages? (Mark one) Yes No
- A. Western Association of Map Libraries' Map Librarian's Toolbox? Yes No
  - B. Memorial University Map Library Cataloguing Helpers? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. ALA Map and Geography Round Table web pages? (Mark one) Yes No
  - D. OCLC Map Group web pages? (Mark one) Yes No
  - E. Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche Groupe des Cartothécaires de LIBER web pages? (Mark one) Yes No
20. Do you use other Map Cataloguing Helper Pages? (Mark one) Yes No
- A. Western Association of Map Libraries' Map Librarian's Toolbox? (Mark one) Yes No
  - B. Memorial University Map Library Cataloguing Helpers? (Mark one) Yes No
  - C. ALA Map and Geography Round Table web pages? (Mark one) Yes No
  - D. OCLC Map Group web pages? (Mark one) Yes No



- E. Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche Groupe des Cartothécaires de LIBER web pages? (Mark one) Yes No
21. Have you had training in map cataloguing in the past 5 years?  
(Mark one) Yes No
22. What type of training have you had?
- |    |                      |            |     |    |
|----|----------------------|------------|-----|----|
| A. | In house workshops?  | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| B. | In house one on one? | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| C. | Regional workshops?  | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| D. | National workshops?  | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
23. Are there cataloguing areas where you would like to have additional training? Yes No
24. What are these areas? (Circle or mark ones of interest and/or describe them)
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| A. | Metadata for geospatial digital data?    |
| B. | Digital data cataloguing?                |
| C. | Authorities?                             |
| D. | Coding of fixed fields?                  |
| E. | Coding of variable fields?               |
| F. | Main entry?                              |
| G. | Imprint?                                 |
| H. | Physical description?                    |
| I. | Subject headings?                        |
| J. | Other subject headings?                  |
| K. | Finding sources of copy for cataloguing? |
| L. | Using sources of copy for cataloguing?   |
| M. | Series?                                  |
| N. | Other (please name)?                     |
25. Would you be able to attend a map cataloguing workshop should one be offered?
- |    |                           |            |     |    |
|----|---------------------------|------------|-----|----|
| A. | In your region?           | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| B. | At a national conference? | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
26. What is the length of workshop that you would prefer?
- |    |             |            |     |    |
|----|-------------|------------|-----|----|
| A. | One day?    | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| B. | Two days?   | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| C. | Three days? | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
| D. | A week?     | (Mark one) | Yes | No |
27. Are you creating metadata for geospatial data? (Mark one) Yes No
28. If not, why not? Please describe.
29. Do you have any other comments regarding map cataloguing? (Please write them in the space below here)

Please send the filled in survey to

Alberta Auringer Wood  
 Maps, Data, and Media Librarian  
 Memorial University of Newfoundland  
 St. John's, NL  
 A1B 3Y1

By regular mail or by email to  
 awood@mun.ca

## APPENDIX B

### Respondents to Map Cataloguing Survey 2004

In Alphabetical Order by Institution Name

Acadia University	University of Waterloo
Brock University	University of Western Ontario
Carleton University	University of Windsor
Dalhousie University	University of Winnipeg
Lakehead University	West Vancouver Memorial Library
Library and Archives of Canada	Wilfred Laurier University
McGill University	York University
McMaster University	
Memorial University of Newfoundland	
Mount Allison University	
Mount St. Vincent University	
Natural Resources Canada, Geoscience Research Library,	
Natural Resources Canada, Earth Sciences Information Centre	
Nova Scotia Community College, Centre of Geographic Sciences	
Queen's University	
Ryerson University	
Saskatchewan Environmental Forestry Information Centre	
Simon Fraser University	
Université de Moncton	
Université de Sherbrooke	
Université Laval	
University of Alberta	
University of British Columbia	
University of Calgary	
University of Lethbridge	
University of Manitoba	
University of New Brunswick	
University of Northern British Columbia	
University of Ottawa	
University of Regina	
University of Saskatchewan	
University of Toronto	
University of Victoria	

## APPENDIX C

### WEB ADDRESSES FOR SITES MENTIONED IN THE TEXT

ACMLA top page – <http://www.acmla.org/> or <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/acml/acmla.html>

ALA MAGERT web page – <http://magert.who.edu:8000/>

British Cartographic Society Map Curators Group –

<http://www.cartography.org.uk/Pages/Groups/Curators/index.html>

Core Level Cataloguing – <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/acml/bcc/bcc5.pdf>

LIBER Groupe des Cartothécaires – <http://www.kb.nl/infolev/liber/intro.htm>

Library of Congress G Schedule for Atlases – <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/acml/lcg.html>

Links To Web Resources – <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/acml/bcc/bccwebres.html>

Map Cataloging Manual – <http://www.itsmarc.com/crs/map0001.htm>

MARC 21 – <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/>

Memorial University (MUN) Map Library Cataloguing Helpers –

<http://www.library.mun.ca/qeii/maps/cata.php>

OCUL Map Group – <http://www.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ocul/oculmap.html>

Reports And Documents – <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/acml/bcc/bccpage.html>

WAML – <http://www.waml.org/maptools.html>