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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | MARC According to DACS |
| **Reviewer:** | Jennifer Pelose |

Directions:

* Quantitative: Each item below begins with a **bolded** statement. Score each with a 1-5 ranking to indicate your assessment of the veracity of that statement based on your review of workshop overviews/agendas, evaluations, and other materials.
* Qualitative: In the comments section for each item below, please respond to the additional questions posed and any related issues that this workshop raises for you.
* Provide any additional assessments or comments not relevant to one of the specific, numbered areas in the space provided following the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Please place an “x” in the appropriate column, use* ***1=low****, undesirable, to* ***5=high****, excellent.* | | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Does the content **appeal to its specified audience**? Does it indicate specific categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise to assist potential participants in determining the workshop's relevance for them?   Comments: Yes—not many archivists work with MARC on a consistent basis. This course provides a skill which many archivists would like to acquire, and relates it to descriptive standards that they already know (and may have some difficulty translating) | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 1. To what extent does the subject matter **reflect current archival practices** and theory commonly accepted in the profession?   Comments: Very much so. DACS is used throughout the archives profession. Will this class be revised to accommodate upcoming changes with RDA? | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 3.. How **relevant/appropriate are the teaching and delivery methodologies** (lecture, video, PowerPoint, exercises, film, audiotape, discussion, simulation, case study, opportunities for in-course feedback, etc.) to the articulated goals and objectives, and to the content?"  Comments: I took this class several years ago, and I found the PowerPoint examples to be helpful, and that they stimulated questions/discussion in the class. | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 1. How workable is the **time line** or **agenda** for the course? Is there sufficient detail to indicate how the workshop will evolve? Does it allow sufficient time for active engagement between course participants and the instructor(s)?   Comments: Yes, the class seems to be paced appropriately. | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 1. To what degree does the **list of assigned readings** support the content of the proposal?   Comments: I didn’t see too many references to outside sources. | | |  |  | X |  |  |
| 6. Does the presentation support the Learning Outcomes in the descriptions?  Comments: More cataloging resources/web sites/ reading lists would be helpful for reference after completion of the course. I took the course several years ago when first offered, and learned a lot which I brought back to my job and put into practice. | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| **A&D Track Considerations** | | | | | | | |
| 1.Does this content bridge, enhance, and/or build on other workshops (If so, please name) | This course builds upon principles covered in Arrangement and Description of Manuscript Collections, Encoded Archival Description, and DACS: A Content Standard. It also provides a solid basis for Applying DACS to Single-item Manuscript Cataloging. | | | | | | |
| 2.Does this build on other workshops not on the list? | The class is a great course for learning and/or reviewing the principles of archival cataloging and how it corresponds with DACS—something that is not always covered in library school archival programs or learned on the job at many archival repositories. | | | | | | |
| 3 Should this be part of the A&D Track? | Yes, it should be part of the A&D track. | | | | | | |
| 4.Where would this workshop fall in the sequence of an A&D track? | This course should be taken after fundamental courses since it covers concepts beyond basic archival description; but not quite high-end rare book or single-item cataloging. | | | | | | |
| Why? | The course content is beyond the basic fundamentals of archival description, but not as advanced as single item cataloging. The course provides helpful examples for students as well. | | | | | | |
| 5. What tier does this workshop fall in? (See attached tiers) | This course would be best placed in the Tactical and Strategic category. | | | | | | |
| 6. Target Audience | Attached list of tracks can be used to indicate appropriate level of experience and job function | | | | | | |
| 7. Is the suggested prior “experience/knowledge” appropriate? | Participants would best benefit from taking DACS: A Content Standard, Encoded Archival Description, and have some processing experience before taking this course. | | | | | | |
| 8. Learning Outcomes:  Are they appropriate and/or relevant? | Yes, learning outcomes as stated in the PowerPoint presentation are accurate, and appropriate. A lot of material is covered in the class, but two days is the perfect amount of time to cover the topic. | | | | | | |
| 9. What should they be?  Please list learning outcomes. | The learning outcomes are identified as:   * Understand how to catalog archivally * Understand archival cataloging as a part of a larger descriptive apparatus * Gain familiarity with the tools of archival cataloging, especially *DACS* * Gain understanding of archival cataloging best practice   All are appropriate since they cover the topic in day-to-day activities, and also provide a “big picture” view of how the content fits into the larger descriptive landscape. | | | | | | |
| 10. Can you make suggestions for competencies this workshop would fulfill? | This workshop reinforces the archivist’s understanding of archival arrangement and descriptive practices, interpretation of DACS, and the relationship between EAD, MARC, and DACS. | | | | | | |
| 11. Would parts of the content lend themselves to a different format? | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Check one: Webinar:   * 30 minute * 90minute | In person:   * 1/2 day * 1 day * 2 day | | | | | | | |
| 12. Which parts? |  | | | | | | |
| 13. Does it lend itself to repurposing as an audio CD? | No, I think this workshop is best in person with PowerPoint presentations and instructors on hand to answer questions. The topic is too specific to be covered on an audio CD; visual examples are needed, as well as the ability for participants to ask questions, as cataloging is so subjective. | | | | | | |
| Which parts? |  | | | | | | |

Other comments:

--This class should remain a two-day, in person class. Having instructors in the room encourages dialogue, especially for a topic as subjective as archival cataloging, and as well as questions from the participants.

--How will RDA (Resource Description and Access) be incorporated into this course? Are there any repositories working with RDA yet?

--The class builds upon basic arrangement and description principles covered in library school archival programs, and also provides a solid foundation for archival cataloging (which is often not covered in library school).

--I would encourage students to be familiar with DACS before attending the class, or perhaps SAA could offer offer the DACS class before the two-day MARC according to DACS workshop (as has been done in the past).