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INTRODUCTION

In the winter of 2012, the VALE Bibliographic Control and Metadata Committee (BCMC) conducted a survey on the national cataloging listserv AUTOCAT on the assessment practices of cataloging departments. One hundred and twenty-three libraries responded to the survey. This poster illustrates the survey results and concludes that most institutions are collecting data on cataloging efficiency and quality, but few are assessing the impact of cataloging on institutional success and overall user experience. To better demonstrate the value of cataloging, assessment practices need to shift from measuring production of catalogers and quality of individual MARC fields to measuring impact on the user and the success of the overall institution. Assessment must show that Quality Cataloging = Quality Discovery.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Library Type

Academic Libraries: 77.9%
Public Libraries: 13.5%

Full Time Professional Catalogers

0: 6.4%
1: 43.6%
2-5: 38.2%

RESULTS

Percentage of cataloging departments that perform assessment

- Yes: 58.7%
- No: 33.1%
- Other: 8.3%

Areas that cataloging departments measure:

- Productivity (76.3%)
- Quality (57.7%)
- Impact on Users and Institutional Success (16.5%)

Top ten elements considered for evaluating bibliographic record quality

- Physical description
- Dates
- Spelling/grammar
- Publication information
- Identification numbers
- Classification number
- Edition statement
- Authority control
- Source of cat. record
- Series

Methods used to assess impact of cataloging on institution and users

- Impact is not assessed: 80%
- Informal user feedback: 40.2%
- Log Analysis: 21.6%
- Surveys: 18.6%
- Other: 13.5%

Reasons for conducting assessment

- It is required by my library: 61.6%
- It is required by my institution or an outside affiliated organization: 24.2%
- It is good practice for departmental management: 16.8%
- It is a way to show the value of the cataloging department: 55.8%

Methods or instruments used to assess cataloging efficiency

- Gathering production statistics: 78.4%
- Recording & analyzing turn-around time: 21.6%
- Conducting cost analysis: 18.6%
- Cataloging efficiency is not assessed: 6.9%
- Other: 0%

Methods used to assess quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor review</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User feedback</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not assess quality</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining error rates &amp; analyzing errors</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINDINGS

- Most cataloging departments perform assessment. Productivity and quality are assessed most.
- Very few cataloging departments assess the impact of cataloging, which is needed to demonstrate the value and contribution of cataloging to the institution's success and users’ experience.
- The overwhelming majority of the respondents measure efficiency by gathering production statistics.
- Most quality assessment is done by supervisor review and user feedback.