

## Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities Users' Group Meeting February 11 2008, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 a.m

*Present:* Lisa Andrews-Attwater (*Rotman*), Alastair Boyd (*Robarts*), Joyce Chyrski (*Robarts CDD*), Anne Dondertman (*Fisher*), Barbara Geiger (*St Augustine's*), Mary Jaques (*Regis*), Blair Kuntz (*Robarts*), Connie Lewin (*St. Michael's*), Diana Liang (*UTSC*), P. J. MacDougall (*Massey*), Mary McDiarmid (*Baycrest/HSICT*), Felicity Pickup (*Robarts Ref.*), H. Rashid (*Law*), Fabiano Rocha (*Robarts*), Sirpa Ruotsalainen (*Trinity*), Mary Ruscillo (*Robarts*), Anna Slawek (*Robarts*), Sherry Smuggler (*DMGIS*), Carmen Socknat (*Victoria*), Eva Spevak (*Robarts*), Elisa Sze (*FIS*)

### 1. Approval of Minutes of November 26 Meeting

Minutes approved with two corrections: p. 2, the repeated phrase “*for keeping*” has been removed; p. 4., paragraph b) now reads: “...*the Law library has considered using not only the public note field (subfield [z]) in the holdings 852 field, but also the 867 and 868 fields for listing supplements and indexes. Sirsi shows the correct labels for these, and thus it would make for a precise display ....*”

### 2. Business Arising

Alastair Boyd (*Robarts*) followed up the questions from the previous meeting about U of T records in WorldCat. OCLC has not yet finished matching and loading the first set of records that Thomas Chan (*ITS*) sent in March 2007. OCLC reports about 580,000 “unresolved” records which they have not matched or loaded. So the pre-2007 records that CAUG members have not been able to find in WorldCat are presumably included in this half million. Tom has asked for details but has not yet received any answers. He will let us know as soon as there is some progress. Regarding record maintenance in WorldCat: OCLC has confirmed that this is up to the libraries concerned. Only the owning library using their own login can remove their holdings from a WorldCat record. OCLC also confirms that there *is* a credit for contributing original records in batch mode rather than through Connexion, but it is much smaller—in the order of cents per record rather than dollars.

### 3. Questions about Order Records

Some members have reported a continuing problem with orders being attached to call numbers from other libraries (as it might be a Robarts order attached to a Victoria call number, or vice versa). Alastair confirmed that he sees dozens of cases like this every month. It is not clear whether book selectors are sometimes choosing to hitch orders to existing call numbers from other libraries as a shortcut, or whether cataloguers are taking over other libraries' order call numbers to save adding one for themselves—or a bit of both. We should remind both selectors and cataloguers that having someone else's order attached to your call number will prevent your from dropping your holdings, should you ever want to do that.

Concerning Cancelled Orders: a CAUG member had reported seeing records in WorldCat which in fact were order records for which the orders had been cancelled. It is obviously misleading to have non-existent holdings listed in OCLC. It arose because Tom's WorldCat selection script assumes that order records have 0 copies, and these cancelled orders had copy records with shadowed location CANCEL\_ORD. Elizabeth Black had suggested this method for suppressing the public display of cancelled orders. From now on, Alastair recommends that the order call number be shadowed instead of adding the CANCEL\_ORD location with a dummy barcode. This will also leave the record available for use by another library, if the need should ever arise.

### 4. Deleting 090 fields

There had been some prior discussion on the CatInfo about the procedures or at least etiquette for deleting the obsolete 090 fields. Some cataloguers have been removing all the 090s in a record at the same time they delete their own, and so some CAUG members felt this should be a standard practice. In general the group agreed, with certain caveats. In essence, the principle is to delete only those 090 for which the call number and holdings information has already been shifted to the Vol/Copy and/or MARC holdings records. When there appears to be a discrepancy or if any information might be lost (including special location or format

designations) then the 090 should be left for the owning library to deal with. Generally speaking, monographs are less problematic than serials.

Newer CAUG members were reminded that 090 fields on imported records (e.g. from OCLC) should be removed as part of the initial load and edit process.

## **5. Other business**

There was a question about the Library Identifier symbols we use in the 040 field, indicating which institutions have created and subsequently upgraded, added or otherwise changed non-local fields in bib records. There used to be a link from the LC MARC page, where all these could be searched. However, this page no longer includes codes for “foreign” countries whose codes are not assigned by the US. Such as Canada, whose codes are assigned by Library and Archives Canada, and whose website one now has to consult to look up codes for Canadian libraries. Possibly because this list is only for Canadian institutions, the “Ca” prefix has gone from the codes as listed at LAC (e.g. CaOTU and CaOTV appear as OTU and OTV). *Question:* should we adopt the new form or continue using the old? *Answer:* these codes really are just for cataloguers, since this is not something the public will see or use. It might therefore be simpler to continue with the familiar forms.

The next meeting is currently scheduled for Monday, May 26.

***The meeting adjourned at 11:30.***