

CATALOGING STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Summary of meeting of September 16, 1988

Present: Sam Garwood (chair), Marilyn Lutz, Anna McGrath, Anne Myers, Harry Whitmore, Sharon Johnson, Sheila Bearor, Albert Howard, Eva Dimond, Kay Alley, Diane Hanscom (visiting from UMM).
Absent: Susan Robertson

Meeting was held in the Ham room of the Memorial Union on the Orono campus, from 10 am until about 1:45 pm.

1. Each campus library representative gave a brief report on the status of barcoding and URSUS system use at the respective libraries.

UM Most barcoding of the circulating collection is complete, except for about 1/3 of the Dewey collection. Most staff terminals are connected. The OCLC interface is in use for downloading. Several database cleanup projects are underway. Item records are being created, but so far only for newly acquired materials.

FK Barcoding is complete for the circulating collection. Only one terminal is online. No online processing is being done yet.

MAC Barcoding is complete except for A-V. No online processing being done.

PI Barcoding of LC materials is near completion. No Dewey items barcoded yet. One terminal online, in the public area. No processing being done yet.

USM Public terminals are in place, with great user enthusiasm. Barcoding is done. Downloading, database cleanup, and item record creation and deletion are being done.

LAW Barcoding nearly complete for the circulating collection (nearly 100,000 items). No terminals or wiring are in place for URSUS terminals. No LAW records are in the database. Innovacq database is being cleaned up, and downloading is taking place from RLIN into Innovacq.

FAR Barcoding of circulating collection is 2/3 - 3/4 done. Two terminals are online. Some database cleanup, a few item records being added.

AUG Barcoding done. Records are being deleted for items no longer in the collection. Experiencing communication line problems.

2. M. Lutz gave a brief explanation of the reasons for delays in terminal installation, and a projected schedule for implementation. Most or all Orono and USM terminals should be up within the next 2 weeks. PI and FAR OCLC interfaces are scheduled for installation before September 27, with a training session on the 27th. The remaining libraries should come up in October.
3. M. Lutz reviewed recent changes to the database, and explained the reason for the change to single-character campus codes on the browse screen. Passwording, which is linked to menus and port definitions, will be defined for each campus as that campus's terminals are installed.
4. The Committee reviewed the minutes from the August meeting and engaged in further discussion of a variety of issues:
 - There is a problem of duplicates in the data base due to past cataloging practices, where an OCLC record was modified to represent a different edition. When another campus uses the correct record, the result is two records in URSUS that are identical except for OCLC #. Since duplicate detection is based on OCLC #, the system does not catch these duplicates. This emphasizes the importance of following the guidelines for modification of OCLC records in future cataloging. These duplicates cause unwanted multiple entries on browse screens. They will have to be cleaned up on a case-by-case basis as they are encountered.
 - The status of the review files (system-generated files representing possible errors or problems in the database such as invalid headings, blind references, duplicates, first time use of headings) was discussed. M. Lutz has asked III to make a copy of the contents of the review files so that they can start fresh with current cataloging. Even so, the file listing first time use of headings is growing very rapidly.

As now constituted these files are difficult to use. Entries are in no discernable order, library responsible for the record generating the review file entry cannot be identified, and file manipulation options are very limited. We have no documentation or training on the use of the authority control module.

To avoid unintentional corruption of the database, M. Lutz has closed off access to the review files until staff can be trained on their use. It was clearly recognized, however, that we need to design procedures and assign responsibility for review file maintenance as soon as possible.
 - Default location for records being downloaded from OCLC. Normally the operator keys in a location code, which then becomes the default until changed. However,

*open to
main control?
person*

if an operator is just beginning a downloading session and forgets to include a location code in the first record, the default up to now has been ORO. We agreed that the default location should be a dummy location, and M. Lutz will change the default to '-----'.

10-14

- The committee agreed that, in editing OCLC/RLIN records prior to downloading to URSUS, it is legitimate to fix coding errors (this in addition to the 6 categories of changes listed in the minutes of the 8/18/88 meeting.)

5. S. Garwood distributed a summary of database cleanup tasks underway at Orono. This was followed by a discussion of several cleanup issues. M. Lutz is logging algorithms used by the various libraries to create lists for cleanup projects. She asked that anyone creating such a list share the cleanup procedure with her. She also asked that each library keep a log of problems encountered on URSUS and report to her once a week. Minimum information needed is record number(s) and brief description of the problem.

S. Garwood offered to have Orono staff clean up the few hundred records in which titles were indexed under an initial article. M. Lutz wanted to be sure that these records do not signify a problem in the BNA processing, but it appears that they all derive from incorrect skip or language fields in the individual records. [NOTE: Much of this is now done, but there are a number of records in which the incorrect title index entry comes from an author-title added entry, and that there is no way to skip the article.]

Item record creation. Procedures for item record creation and deletion are cumbersome and error-prone. M. Lutz has written a preliminary set of procedures but further revisions are needed before distribution. She plans to send copies out within the next week. S. Garwood emphasized the need for a thorough understanding of the process by anyone doing it. Otherwise, it is very easy to corrupt or wipe out one's own records or some other library's records, and or to introduce discrepancies between bibliographic records and the corresponding item records. M. Lutz asked that anyone who accidentally wipes out a record belonging to some other library call her for help in reconstructing it.

The question was raised: Is it necessary to change a call number in the bibliographic record when changing it in an item record. Answer: No.

Question: Is it necessary to include location stamps in the call number field in cases where sufficient information is provided in the location field? e.g. If a location field says "Reference", should one also key in "Ref" as the first element in the call number? Answer: Each library should decide which call number stamps should be included in the call number field in its own records. Informal comments showed that nearly all libraries planned not to use call number stamps with redundant location

6.
January
Kline
III
written in a few weeks

new record all info -> MZ will make instructions

information.

7. Status of the keyword index. The keyword index is now available, for the present in technical mode only. It indexes only the 245 field. At some later time it will be extended to other fields. M. Lutz has sent a stopword list to III, but this has not yet been applied in the database. There may be some revisions to the list; she will send copies out when it is complete.
8. A - V terminology. Different libraries sometimes use different terms in call numbers to describe identical A-V formats, e.g. audiocassette, audiocass., cassette. Consistency in terminology would make the database less confusing to library users. On the other hand, the terms now being used correspond to terms on the pieces themselves, so a cleanup might also cause confusion. This is mainly a cosmetic issue which the committee decided to put off until more important issues were taken care of.
9. Serial problems. There was a discussion of the pros and cons of adding item records for serials. Those serial titles now in the data base each have only a single item record with no volume or year designation. (The same is true of multivolume monograph sets.) If that item record is completed by adding an actual volume number, it will then appear to catalog users that the library has only one volume of the serial. On the other hand, if item records are created for every volume of the serial, we run the risk of creating a long list of items that cannot be made to display in a useful sequence, because we do not know what III will do about sequencing item records. This could then result in having to go back later and re-edit these item records to get them to sort properly. Also, it may not be desirable to create very long lists of item records for materials that rarely circulate.

One suggestion: to create a dummy item record giving summary holdings. This might be the first or only item record for a long serial run. We can do this, but we don't yet know the implications for the Innovacq upload later this year. S. Bearor asked for advice on a cutoff number above which it would be best not to create item records for now. S. Garwood suggested that probably little or no harm would be done by adding as many as 8 or 10 item records. This is all subjective, however. We hope to have more information on III's plans for sequencing multiple item records by the next meeting.

S. Garwood distributed copies of a memo to Orono department heads detailing present gaps and limitations in URSUS, serial holdings being the most serious.

The next committee meeting was tentatively set for Friday, Oct. 14, at the system offices in Bangor.

Sam Garwood

*stopword list
for Garwood*

** 15 min
will work
in this
only 10 item
records*