

Cataloging Standards Committee Minutes for Friday, May 30, 2003

Present: Sheila Bearor (LEG), Gretchen Brissette (UMPI), Laura Gallucci (SYS), Leslie Kelly (UMFK), Peggi Loveless (AUG), Lanny Lumbert (USM) Sharon Quinn Fitzgerald (ORO), Mary Saunders (MSL), Judy Steere (FAR), Lynn Wilcox (LAW)

Absent: Jean Clemons (UMM), Judie Leighton (BPL)

1. Laura distributed the current roster to the group asking for updates. The group agreed it was acceptable to post the members on the web.
2. The minutes from the January 3, 2003 meeting were unanimously accepted.
3. Review "Meet me" call- "What to do with issues that need Committee attention between meetings?" Laura distributed one solution for the Committee to consider -

"If an issue arises that needs the input of the Catalog Standards Committee, and a meeting is not scheduled for months, call the Chair and request a "Meet me" call. A "Meet me" call is a conference call of up to 14 people, set at a certain time and date. Preliminary materials should be provided to all Committee members prior to the meet me call."

The group meets 3 times a year in person. There is concern that if an issue is raised between meetings, discussion on the issue may have to wait, holding up the project. There was a discussion on Laura's suggestion of a "Meet me" call. The group agreed this sounded like a good solution. Laura will ask the chair before setting up the phone meeting.

4. cat date vs. create date clarification in Bib records - Cat dates and bib dates are not really accurate. If records overlaid will update the cat date, this could be an old record. Create date of the bib. record would be the accurate barometer of a record. Concern was expressed about the need for the committee to know what is happening with the date. (Lynn Wilcox) Laura emphasized that the create date is the solid date to use, uploads do not alter. OCLC Marcive service processing manipulates the cataloged date.

5. Approval of headings - Note 653 could be used for non standard headings. A concern was expressed that split files could be created in the Webpac making it a disservice for our patrons. Is the 653 field indexed? May not be a point to add this field if it is not indexed. A strong concern was that the databases would be degraded if we just start using local headings. The 653 is not through the authority process. May use meet me call to discuss use of local heading before the heading is used. How important is heading to special collections? Do they mean to limit? III does not picked-up but authority process will. Need for non-standard headings, not run through authority, but need to run through committee for appropriateness before used. The committee agreed to work closely with

special collections. Chair will send out the subject area before “Meet me” call is set-up. Questioned the 690 field and if it shows on the OCLC Report. Orono’s special collections project will use 653 to complete. Need to document the use of local headings so there are no surprises later.

6. Gretchen will try to schedule the next meeting for Friday, September 19th at Auburn Hall in Bangor. The alternate date is September 12th.

7. (a.) Heading Issues (Lynn Wilcox-LAW) – Questioned reports and what the reports were telling us. There was a discussion of the draft action plan and the following points were emphasized at the meeting.

- If we don’t verify headings this will create problems and splits – emphasize the importance of verification. Can we verify in Millennium? There are lots of new features coming in the new release. Procedures for authority work done on original cataloging are in the standards documents – we should already be doing this. Lynn Wilcox demonstrated verify headings. “If copied from OCLC the record is good?” Questioned CIP records – checks to make sure qualified.
- No cat dates in order Bib – Question of access points it was stressed to not put subject headings in order bibs.

Question data loss? Yes there was data loss, some authority records not past. There was a brief discussion of reports given by URSUS after authority run.

- Suppressing for a period, Blind ref., duplicate, non-unique 4xx – The committee agreed to suppressing and will discuss at next meeting about when will be acceptable to delete. Record lost when moved to a review file. Laura will discuss with OCLC.

(b.) Duplicates report

How come Yankee records not duplicate?

False dup on ISBN

Could dup. Report not look at suppressed records? III can’t do – less than 30% really are duplicates for Orono, Discussion of Yankee, goes in without OCLC number, add OCLC numbers latter, then back to OCLC to add symbols. Will remove ISBN check and will try for a while.

Marchive – profile checks system before loads, gives a chance to check before loaded

Question systems “thing” versus standards manual

8. Electronic serials CONSER (Sharon Fitzgerlad-ORO)– Explanation of the new policy adopted by CONSER with a short discussion by the committee. Explanation of 130 qualifier field and issue of scoping and the Webpac.

Aggregator neutral 260 field
710 field EBSCO

The example given was PsychInfo – When possible use aggregator neutral 130 record, 260 has provider, will not be a user issue and allow record to be shared.

Question the removal of 510 field. CONSER does not support 510, do we want to remove the 510 field. What would be to gain? Not index. Tell public service and collection development. Decided not to add but would not make sense to delete.

CONSER web journals are described differently. The committee will look at and discuss in the future.

9. Mat type 4 – Mat type 4 indicates e-book but points to netLibrary ebooks. How do we handle now that there are other e-books being cataloged in URSUS that are not from netLibrary? netLibrary ebooks are not in the electronic resources scope. There are two potential solutions. Undo the netLibrary scope and add c or keep mat. type 4 and undo direct link to netLibrary.

If one library owns the hardcopy and another the electronic copy is there a bib for each or do they share the same bib?

How does bib represent all formats that are attached?

How will this effect scoping and ownership?

Committee stressed this is a technical and public services issues and is not solvable at this time. A separate bib would be a disservice to users on one level and yet would present a problem for library's who inter-shelf mediums.

The 533 field describes electronic version. The group seemed to feel that one record would be used if the electronic version was an exact reproduction simply presented in a different medium.

Do we broaden mat. type 4? The committee talked about how broadening the mat. type would effect the limit function.

The committee agreed that when limiting to e-books, all e-books should be returned but would like to work with the public service staff. Laura will investigate what will happen to the "Limit to netLibrary ebooks" check box.

10. Audio books and multiple versions (Judy Steere – FAR) -The committee returned to the discussion of how to handle multiple mediums of the same title. Multiple versions of monographs understand and for serials and electronic but for books 300, 511, & 650 have been added to OCLC record dates not changed. 2 formats on 1 record. OCLC record change is hybrid, This is confusing for patrons. Presque Isle intershelves mediums and the call # does not indicate medium. The patron will only find out the medium when they find the item on the shelf. What is the deciding point to add audio to existing book? What

we agreed upon needs to be added to the standards document. The committee will try a pilot approach, experimenting to see how this will affect the patron.

Examine how multi-formats are being handled on the technical side and how is playing out in public services. Included in the investigation will be the impact on scoping and limiting.

Laura noted that the URSUS server is already reaching capacity and may not be able to handle multiple bibs.

Committee will table until there are some discussions with public services staff. Laura will look at from public services perspective, exact repro. At an item

11. Connexion issues – There have been lots of problems with Connexion. It has been slow and very often crashes. There haven't been any solutions offered by OCLC.

12. Global Updating Demo – Hands on

Major points:

- If conducting global updating on bib records, they need to be on bibs only you are attached.
- Ask if yourself if you really want who you have authorized to really have access - let Laura know if you need to change authorization.
- Let Laura know how you are using just to make sure everything is working correctly.

13. Virtual Bookplates (Sharon Fitzgerald – ORO) - The committee discussed the idea of adding a local gift note in the bibliographic record. The committee discussed the 856 field. Would like the donor field to display and be indexed, noting a problem with the description. Laura noted that the local info doesn't get overlaid. The committee discussed the 700 type field. Special collections use the 541 field and it is protected in the profiling. Would like to include the donors name and 3 letter code (oro). The committee liked the idea but questioned syntax and field.

Could you use access number as campus?

More than one field used?

Repeatable field would help with the medium?

Make stuff up be careful???

Will schedule a meet-me call

The following committee members will form a sub-committee to look over the policy manual: Sheila, Judy, Peggy, Lynn, Gretchen and Laura.

Something new to form, I-type please inform everyone

Why I-types are campus specific? (Next meeting)

Committee agreed to handle state-code with an email?

14. MULS – Questions from different libraries how to represent electronic format in MULS - subfield z (electronic). Goal of MULS – ILL can we share e-journal because of copyright?

Authority section for policy manual