

CATALOGING STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Summary of meeting of May 19, 1989

Present: Sam Garwood (Chair), Anna McGrath, Albert Howard, Lynn Wilcox, Eva Dimond, Priscilla Rancourt, Sheila Bearor, Jean Clemons, Susan Robertson, Marilyn Lutz

Meeting was held in the Ham Room of the Memorial Union on the Orono campus from 10 am. - 2:30 pm.

* FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 28.

Clarification, p.3, no.4: We did decide to download an authority record for the higher body when the name of that body is used only with a subdivision, provided that the authority record contains an x-ref.

** REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF POLICY DECISIONS MADE TO DATE.

A document, drafted by Sam in outline form, contains decisions we have made in committee meetings to date. It is also intended to help us identify areas needing attention. Lynn also developed a draft using a format similar to manuals used at the Law Library. To avoid confusion, only Sam's draft was distributed for discussion. Sam stated, however, that he may want to incorporate Lynn's treatment of bibliographic records into his original document.

from the draft document:

Cataloging Standards Committee Decisions

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS.

A. Record creation

1. Downloading

a. Permitted changes in OCLC/RLIN records

If libraries alter an OCLC record before downloading into URSUS, we run the risk of having two records with the same OCLC number representing two different books. The system would regard these records as duplicates even though the text of one had been altered.

After Lynn's explanation of record creation in RLIN, we decided to change the heading of this section to "Permitted changes in OCLC records." In RLIN, each library creates its own record on the system, and so the concept of master record does not apply in the way that it does in OCLC.

b. Verification required for fields

Discussion of the importance of filing indicators led to two recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 1. It is recommended that each library be responsible for the accuracy of filing indicators for all of their downloaded records, English and foreign language alike.

RECOMMENDATION 2. It is recommended that, at the time of cataloging, libraries eliminate initial articles in indexed fields which have no filing indicator.

Examples: series statement: (4XX)

author/title entries: (1XX,6XX,7XX,8XX)

1.A.2. Keying

- a. Minimum fields required - permanent records - No change
- b. Minimum fields required - circ on the fly and other temporary records

It was recognized that there are some fairly poor circ on the fly records in the database. It is possible for us to recommend guidelines for circ on the fly records as well as other temporary records. The committee recognized this as an area needing some attention.

Marilyn mentioned the case of material not owned by a library being placed on reserve, such as personal copies or photocopies. At present, bib records for these materials must be input through the cataloging module. The plan is to define an "n" in BCODE 3 (b3- when downloading) to suppress the records from display in the public catalog. Materials will remain accessible in the faculty and course indexes.

It was agreed that a heretofore uncataloged circulating paperback collection would require minimal level cataloging for permanent records, as defined in 1.A.2.a. (above).

1.A.3. Other

- a. MARC format to be used in keying in records, except for circ on the fly

Reaffirmed that everyone agrees with the use of the MARC format in keyed in minimal level records.

1.B. Editing existing records - No change

1.C. Record precedence - Deferred discussion to later in meeting

1.D. Duplicate records

QUESTION: If we are searching URSUS before downloading, why are we ending up with duplicate bib records?

ANSWER: Either the searching contains errors or the records aren't indexed properly. If you find a case of the latter, Marilyn needs to know about it.

The procedure for dealing with duplicate bib records is to notify the library responsible for the record with the latest cataloging date. Catalogers at that library will resolve the problem and delete whatever record(s) need to be deleted. They will transfer any of their holdings to new records as needed. If other libraries have records attached to a duplicate record, the library resolving the problem will contact these other holding libraries for permission to transfer their records.

I.E. Record deletion

REMINDER: If you delete the last item attached to a bib record, you should delete the bib record also.

I.F. Policies pertaining to specific fields

ADD: If there is an 092 field in an OCLC record which you are going to download, and you are not going to use that call #, the 092 tag needs to be changed to a 949 tag.

(RLIN doesn't present this problem. The RLIN operator must key in a call #. This produces a call # with a tag of 950. The original call #s remain in the bib record.)

II. ITEM RECORDS

A. Record creation

1.b. ADD: RLIN libraries should attach an RLIN number to an OCLC bib record to which they attach an item.

2.c. Marilyn will check again on the advisability of using an 090 tag when inserting an LC call # into an item. Previously, we were assured that the tag was not needed. Sam is questioning this.

3.a. Lynn recommends the addition of the abbreviation: "updt." for Update.

It has been noted that VIPS information is not being input consistently in the cases of more than a one level breakdown. [Ex. vol. & date; vol. & edition.]

II.B. Editing existing records - no changes

III. Authority records

III.B.2. Record creation - downloading

If you delete a field from an authority record, add a 699 field to read "incomplete."

III.B.3. Record creation - keying

Albert requested that in cases of keying in original

authority records, the cataloger add a field with the bib number of the record which generates the authority record.

III.C. Editing existing records

Eva reported that global updating is not working

III.D. Review file procedures

ORO has been moving toward more complete checking of lists as a result of last meeting's discussion.

III.E. Record deletion - no discussion yet

IV. Miscellaneous

The reason for clearing creation of lists which search 15,000 or more records is to schedule for minimum system slow-down.

Now that we have a structure for logging decisions, we need to look for areas needing attention, such as temporary records.

*** POLICY ON CREATION OF NEW RECORDS VS. USE OF EXISTING RECORDS WHICH MAY BE INCOMPLETE OR INACCURATE

Lynn stated that the NELINET Cataloging Quality Control Committee has been working on a 1-page guide on when to create a new record, which we can all use. There was, therefore, no need to spend time on this during the meeting.

QUESTION: How do we handle duplicates already in the database?

ANSWER: Notify cataloger at library responsible for duplicate record, so that each library handles its own duplicate problems.

Marilyn would like to receive statistics each month from libraries correcting duplicate bib record problems (records involving more than one library).

**** POLICY ON LATEST VS. SUCCESSIVE ENTRY

Sam reviewed the information he received from the libraries concerning their current policies and their concerns about changing to policy of latest entry for URSUS:

ORO: Orono now uses successive entry in cataloging serials. Their concerns:

a. We would be deviating from nationally accepted standards.

b. Orono's periodicals are not classed and they will have a problem either way, once the VACQ is up, letting

patrons know how they are shelved.

c. The length of the holdings field in the VACQ might not be long enough to hold a complex holdings statement.

d. Someone will need to take the time to edit the holdings statements in the VACQ.

e. Who decides when a title has changed?
(Organizational issue)

MAC: Latest entry used now - no problem either way.

AUG: No problem either way.

FAR: Latest entry most convenient for catalogers, but confusing for patrons.

PI: They support latest entry even though they are using successive entry now. They don't have enough titles to consider a change a big problem.

LAW: They have already entered their titles in latest entry form and do not plan to change. They can act somewhat independently in this since, for the most part, their records will remain in the database as duplicates.

They use an extensive system of dummies in their stacks to point patrons to earlier and later changes. They have not had any problems (yet) with the length of the holdings statement.

USM: Supports latest entry.

Sam mentioned that MULS is now done as successive entry and that it would be a problem to reconvert those entries to latest entry.

*****SPECIFIC AUTHORITY PROBLEMS

There was not enough time to cover the agenda and this item was skipped.

*****PERIODICAL CHECKOUT ON THE FLY

Marilyn is encouraging libraries to stop circulating periodicals. The incomplete representation of holdings is misleading to patrons.

Next meeting: July 14, 1989