

CATALOGING STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
Summary of meeting of December 16, 1988

Present: Sam Garwood (Chair), Marilyn Lutz, Diane Hanscom, Anne Myers, Anna McGrath, Sharon Johnson, Albert Howard, Susan Robertson, Eva Dimond.

Meeting was held in the Conference Room of Auburn Hall on the Bangor Campus from 10 am - 2 pm.

1. Questions from the Nov. 11 meeting were postponed until later in the meeting in order to keep to the agenda.

2. Gap tape load:

Sequence of events:

a. Early Nov., started to load LC gap tapes and LC Microcon tapes. Loaded 40,000 bib records and discovered there were no item records attached.

b. Loaded Dewey gap tapes and Dewey Microcon tapes.

c. De-duped Dewey records against the original tape load. Lost location information for bib records replaced.

d. De-duped 40,000 itemless LC bib records against original tape load. Lost location information for bib records replaced.

e. Reloaded 40,000 previously loaded LC records plus an additional 20,000 LC records, de-duped them and lost location information for bib records replaced.

The next and, hopefully, final thing to be done to complete this gap tape load is to run a utility program which will restore the lost location information to bib records. This utility program will restore location information based on the item records attached to the bib records.

QUESTION: Should we correct the location information in any bib record we edit as a result of adding (or deleting) an item?

ANSWER: You only need to account for your own campus. The utility program will take care of the rest.

DUPLICATES STILL IN DATABASE:

1. Some OCLC records were on the tapes with a leading 0 (zero) in the OCLC control number and again without the leading 0. URSUS does not recognize these as duplicates. Innovative Interfaces can run a program to identify these. They need to be convinced of their responsibility to do so.

2. Some OCLC records were on the tapes in their original version and again in a revised version which placed the original OCLC# in the 019 field. URSUS does not recognize these as duplicates.

*Monitored  
1-27  
ST:11?*

To clean up these requires special programming.

3. Some of our records were duplicated during AMIGOS processing. i.e.. some records were loaded in the original load and again during the gap tape load. This has produced approximately 10,000 duplicate items. We are trying to get a print-out of these records. They will have to be de-duped one at a time.

Elaine will not have the utility to correct locations run until the problem of the duplicates is resolved.

The next gap tape load is scheduled for January 19, 1989. It will include about 9,000 RLIN records from the Law Library. The rest of their records, which were converted by OCLC, will be loaded in the Spring. Marilyn will try to have the RLIN interface activated by January so that they can download records from RLIN into URSUS.

QUESTION: How likely is it that the this tape load will happen on schedule?

ANSWER: It is possible that it will slide over into February because of other things happening in ~~January~~ <sup>Feb, 21</sup> upload of INNOVACQ, software enhancement in URSUS, ALA Midwinter, a holiday.

LOCAL HOLDINGS DISPLAY:

Marilyn is doing extensive work, port by port, to institute display of local holdings first. When this work is complete, holdings for each campus will display first on the browse screens and the card image screen. If you need any new locations established, TELL HER NOW!

ITEM RECORD CREATION PROCEDURE :

This is the same now regardless of how many campuses have holdings at the time you add an item. The only variations are to change the branch to multi if it does not already read multi, and, to edit directly from the bib location field if it does. From then on, the prompts are the same. There is no fixed field called #ITEMS. You are no longer prompted for a branch already accounted for - you are asked to key in the new branch.

Sheila has discovered that you delete a campus by hitting the space bar when prompted for that branch.

MARILYN'S LIST OF DATABASE CLEAN-UP ISSUES TO BE DEALT WITH BY INNOVATIVE INTERFACES:

1. Uniform titles: Heading in authority record is author/title

*copy paper  
of what intended Feb  
RLIN p*

(tag 100) but in bib record is split between tags 100 and 240. Access to bib records via x-refs does not function. (12,000 records)

2. Similar problem with series (tag 130 in authority record) with author/title x-refs. (3298 records)
3. Dewey call numbers indexed in LC call number index. These need to be de-indexed and re-indexed.
4. Subject headings with subfield w indexed.
5. Duplicate items from AMIGOS extraction.
6. Display of non-LC subject headings in the public mode.
7. Downloading of authority records. Software is still being tested in San Diego.
8. Deleting automatic stamps from Augusta, Bangor and Darling Center records. Deleting other stamps.
9. Titles not indexed for keywords - largely done.

INDEXING SEQUENCE OF DEWEY CALL NUMBERS:

*no Till loads done*

A Dewey whole number with a decimal is listed before the same whole number without a decimal. Therefore:

868.5 V236zda      comes before  
868 B644b

CANCELLATION LISTS:

Marilyn announced that it is now OK to go ahead and cancel records on the cancellation lists. Let her know when you have finished.

INNOVACQ and INNOPAC:

QUESTION: When INNOVACQ is uploaded to INNOPAC, which bib record will take precedence?

ANSWER: This has not been decided. There are several things to consider. Does INNOVACQ map the same fields as INNOPAC? Which system has the best record for any particular title? Which has the newest record for any title? The Libraries need to consider this question of precedence. Meanwhile, Marilyn will talk to Leslie. She will also try to talk to other libraries which have merged the two systems.

*after giff  
+  
inv.  
pww  
mm  
(RLIN #?)*

QUESTION: The Law Library has at least 6,000 order records in INNOVACQ. Will they be able to suppress these from public view? Is the suppression code in INNOVACQ the same as that in INNOPAC?

#### INITIAL ARTICLES:

Catalogers at Orono have run into a strange situation when working with the indexing of initial articles. When they search for titles beginning with an article, they get what looks like an alphabetical list of those. Then, after a portion of those are corrected so that those titles no longer index under the article, the list is searched again and titles are found that were not on the first list. Anne Myers reported that they have run into this. They have also found titles listed out of alphabetical order on the browse screen and cases of the browse screen entries not matching the record. Orono reports also finding a semi-alphabetical browse screen. [Do a title search for Methods of Enzymology and look at the titles listed.]

QUESTION: What does it mean when a search produces two listings made up of information from a note field instead of two titles?

ANSWER: Probably duplicate barcodes.

Marilyn keeps a log of database issues so please report irregularities to her. She calls Innovative Interfaces for an explanation and if their response is unsatisfactory, the problem becomes an issue. She monitors the situation until the problem is resolved.

#### AUTHORITY WORK:

The review files have been a problem. Orono has been printing them and having someone check each item on a list for inputting library, in order to give us all an idea of where the work was originating. Then we photocopied the list for each campus and distributed the copies. This has been time-consuming. Marilyn will push for a change in the file structure to include campus information. Meanwhile, we will follow a suggestion from Sharon Johnson that we divide the file between Orono (2/3) and Southern Maine (1/3). The other campuses will be doing their authority work before downloading.

QUESTION: May we key in authority records?

ANSWER: We are close to having the ability to download authority records and we might want to wait rather than key in those. However, we may key in any we wish (MARC format). Marilyn,

*yes*

*ink in \**  
*system*

will write procedures for this.

Eva Dimond passed out her procedures for checking subject headings in the review file (first time use). All agreed that these procedures were sufficient.

Marilyn asked that we do not do any global updating until we have been trained. After that, any cataloger may update headings, even if they affect records of another campus.

#### RECON UPDATE:

See attached report, updated through December 31, 1988.

#### DOWNLOADING OF OCLC RECORDS:

It was agreed at the August meeting that the following changes were permitted to an OCLC record before downloading to URSUS:

- correction of typographical and coding errors
- adding of local subject headings
- adding titles and other added entries
- changing obsolete headings
- completing CIP information
- changing a pub. date to a copyright date
- deleting a pub. date and retaining the copyright date

QUESTION: Which date does URSUS use for limiting by date and for creating a list?

We have had examples in the URSUS database of OCLC records modified to be used for a different edition of the same title. This becomes a problem when another library needs to add its holdings for that title.

Other problems include incorrect filing indicators for titles and incomplete CIP information.

#### NLM HEADINGS:

NLM headings appear in the database and are indexed for the most part. All agreed that they were desirable to have in URSUS, even though there are problems associated with having them there. Some are in conflict with LC headings; there are no authority records for them; patrons cannot search for other records having those headings from the URSUS menu.

*PAC me  
Taker from VAG*

When we encounter an NLM heading in conflict with an LC x-ref. we will change the x-ref to a see also ref.

Marilyn will see if we can have the non-indexed ones indexed.

#### KEYING IN NEW RECORDS (BIB):

Guidelines from the August meeting were reviewed. It was agreed to add physical description and subject heading to the list of fields required for minimal level records in URSUS. The full list reads as follows:

- author (if there is one)
- title
- publisher
- date
- material type (b1- )
- campus code (b2- )
- cataloger's initials (b3- )
- branch (bn- )
- publications numbers
- physical description
- subject heading

It was agreed to use MARC format when keying in bib records.

A reminder: The system will not catch a duplicate record if it does not have an OCLC number. If you are going to replace a keyed-in record with an OCLC record, you will have to make sure you delete the superseded one.

Circ-on-the-fly records will not be in MARC format. These will be temporary records - we will not be adding items to them.

QUESTION: What do we want to be prompted for when keying in records?

ANSWER: Fixed fields - b1, b2, b3, bn  
Variable fields - author, title, physical description, edition, publisher, subject headings, publication numbers

Indexed fields should be consistent with existing headings. Use existing guidelines when upgrading a minimal level record.

Marilyn will find out how the overlay works.

SERIAL VS. MONOGRAPHIC CATALOGING:

Marilyn suggests we look at this again after INNOVACQ is uploaded.

REPRESENTATION OF HOLDINGS FOR LARGE SETS:

Until a decision is made to add item records for large sets, holdings for each set can be represented by a dummy item record. There is still a question of how the INNOVACQ upload will affect the way in which we deal with serials.

BARCODE ORDER: Marilyn is going to be ordering barcodes soon - let her know what you need for the next 18 months.

Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 27, 1989.

URSUS RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION PROJECT

Report for December 1988

1. Item records created or linked	<u>Current month</u>	<u>Project to date</u>
FORT KENT	5,175	33,536
MACHIAS	6,810	22,822
AUGUSTA (Created)	8,495	8,495
(Linked)	203	203
	-----	-----
TOTAL	20,683	65,056
2. Hours worked *		
Classified	643.25	1761.75
Student	137	517
	-----	-----
TOTAL	780.25	2278.25
3. Records per hour:		
	26.5	28.6
4. Costs**		
	\$ 4689.10	\$ 13,491.69
5. Cost per record		
	\$ .227	\$ .207

\* Temporary workers only. Does not include an estimated 25 hours of professional staff time for training, hiring, supervision.

\*\* Classified staff @ \$6.31 per hour; students @ \$4.60 per hour. No costs included for overhead, furniture or time of regular library staff.

The first pass is now complete for all sections of the Fort Kent shelflist. Machias stack books have been completed through the Dewey 923's. Augusta stack books have been completed through the LC classification HQ. The first pass of Machias and Augusta cards should be complete about the end of January or early February. As soon as the second gap tape load is completed a second pass can begin. Approximately 10,000 Presque Isle records will be searched beginning late January.

Augusta records are more complex to process, due to the various possible cases: Single records needing regular item record creation; single records already in URSUS requiring no action; single records already in URSUS requiring only linking; multiple copy or volume records for which the first record must be linked and edited, and the remaining ones must have new item

records created; records already in URSUS but with the wrong bar code. Lingering problems associated with the gap tape load also complicate these. The result has been an increase in the number of errors and in the amount of time spent on revision.

The hit rate for Machias 800's and 900's continues fairly low, averaging about 60%.

Sam Garwood  
January 6, 1988