

WMI ✓
hr ✓
EB ✓

CATALOGING STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Summary of meeting of April 28, 1989

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

Meeting was held at the Chancellor's Office on the Bangor Campus from 10:00 am. - 2:30 pm.

Anne Myers began a discussion about the work of this committee and the need to reevaluate our goals. It was generally agreed that this committee ranged far beyond cataloging standards, dealing with system issues perhaps better dealt with in another forum. As a result, less time and energy is left to deal with cataloging issues per se. It was suggested that another way be found to disseminate some of this information. Much of it would more appropriately be discussed with library contact people.

Sam made the point that understanding and resolving cataloging issues requires an understanding of what is happening with the system. Although he has been concerned with the direction of the committee, he realizes that cataloging cannot be discussed without reference to system occurrences and issues.

Sharon Johnson and others related that, for them, this committee has been the best source of information on all issues.

Marilyn agreed that disseminating system status reports was not the purpose of the committee. To provide information regarding database issues, and a means of emergency contact (other than the telephone), she will set up an URSUS electronic mail group on BITNET. Recipients would be library contacts and some Cataloging Standards Committee members.

A full update on system clean-up progress will be relayed via BITNET.

Sam announced that the Recon staff might be available for some clean-up tasks for the other campuses.

Sam announced that the GPO tapes may be loaded into URSUS this summer. They contain about 200,000 records for government documents.

Marilyn recommended and the committee agreed that the automatic overlay would be turned off.

VACQ/PAC upload still unsuccessful. We will possibly try to upload some Orono records in order to determine if the problem is in the telecommunications link between southern Maine and Orono CAPS.

DEWEY CALL # index name change - It was agreed to change the name of the Dewey index on the menu screen to: DEWEY AND OTHER CALL #'s.

do not agree

PAC CALL # DISPLAY: The directors have agreed to increase the length of the field for call # display on the public screen by 5 characters. This will be done by shortening the space available for location by 5 characters. This will require that some location designations be abbreviated. As soon as all campuses have sent Sam any necessary changes for their campus location designations, this change will be made.

ADDING LOCATIONS TO URSUS: This is not impossible but Marilyn does not encourage this because of the impact on workflow using circulation functions. It also creates a great deal of work in resetting port definitions.

CONSISTENCY IN USE OF CALL # STAMPS: This cannot be pursued right now - there are too many other more urgent clean-up issues.

Anna requested that we re-open the discussion on the use of the AACR II form of a name when LC has not established it. This discussion evolved into a discussion of the need to document our decisions in a form other than the minutes. Sam will try to see that an initial draft is available before the next meeting.

During the course of this discussion, the importance of bringing examples of problems to these meetings for discussion was emphasized. These will be used to illustrate problems for discussion and to group problems into categories for greater effectiveness in analyzing and setting policies. We will use some of these examples to illustrate decisions in the written document.

We did not alter our previous decision to use headings as established by LC, whether or not they were in AACR II form. The common procedure for selecting a form of a name is to:

1. Use LC authority if it exists.
2. If not, use URSUS form.
3. If no LC or URSUS form, use form used in bib utility.

Sam asked for examples of the kinds of problems for which the committee should develop policies. The following were suggested:

1. Duplicate bib records
2. LC headings which are not in AACR II form
3. non-LC headings in conflict with an LC heading
4. need to create authority records for a higher body when the only heading in URSUS is that body with a subdivision
5. same heading with, and without a death date
6. serial record vs. separate monographic records for the same title

Marilyn will be sending committee members two profile documents, one which lists indexed fields and a MARC mapping document.

AUTHORITY PROBLEMS:

Sam asked Albert and Eva for a report on the kinds of difficulties they are finding in working with review lists. Albert reported that he finds examples of spelling errors (mostly in original cataloging), out-moded subdivisions, headings used in both the singular and plural forms, examples of names used both with and without the death dates. He regards many of the problems as cosmetic. The biggest issue he sees is between AACR II and AACR II compatible headings.

It takes Albert a full day to do the work required for a week's list. Eva says she is not as meticulous and that it takes her less than a day to do the subject headings. She has been eliminating some of the non-LC headings, such as the French headings, and sometimes making see also's when there are more than a few instances of a given conflict with an LC and a non-LC heading.

Lynn passed out examples of the problem involving names only used with a subdivision, with no authority for the higher body in the database. LAW has been keying in authorities for the higher bodies.

SERIALS ISSUES:

1. Representation of holdings
 - a. How important is consistency in representing these holdings? It was agreed that it was desirable for a library to be consistent with itself but not necessarily with the other

libraries. Three examples were used to illustrate three different ways of representing the same information in the 850 field:

v.1-10, 1950-59. perhaps easiest for patron to read

v.1(1950)-10(1959).

1(1950)-10(1959). Innovacq method - might be considered for consistency

b. 850 field input by LC and carrying over to URSUS: No discussion

2. How do we tell a patron where a periodical is shelved if it is not classed? There are many at Urono which are shelved by the issuing body even though the AACR II record uses the title as the main entry.

No discussion

3. Problems presented by items created by circ-on-the-fly records when the holdings are only in summary form in the 850 field. The few circ-on-the-fly records may create a misleading impression of a library's holdings.

No discussion

4. Periodicals with multiple numbering systems. (ORO will use a separate 850 field for each.)

No discussion

5. How do we handle serials that we own in different formats?

No discussion

6. Latest entry vs. successive entry. Both systems are now in use in the system. In an automated system, latest entry would seem to be the better choice and there is talk in the profession of reverting to latest entry in automated environments.

In preparation for the next committee meeting, Sam asked that each library think through the implications for that library of a policy of latest entry in URSUS. Some of the considerations are:

Changes needed in existing records

Effect on shelving, where journals are shelved by title

Being out of sync with the OCLC database, which requires successive entry

Possible confusion to patrons in the case of lengthy title histories

Possible patron confusion when the local library has some earlier title but not the latest title

A committee member from each library is to write a brief draft summary of the effects on the library that would occur if a latest entry policy is adopted for URSUS. Because of the imminence of the VACQ/PAC link (we hope), this draft should be sent to Sam by May 8.

Next meeting: May 19th.