

Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities User Group Meeting June 7, 2005, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 am

Present: Rachael Agnew (Robarts), Elizabeth Black (CDC), Alastair Boyd (Robarts), Michael Bramah (SMC), Mary Canning (UTM), Mudite Eksteins (Robarts), Helen He (Dentistry), Diana Liang (UTSC), Stephen Qiao (East Asian), Sergio Quibus (OISE/UT), H. Rashid (Law), Sirpa Ruotsalainen (Trinity), Mary Ruscillo (Robarts), Dean Seeman (SMC), Arthur Smith (ROM), Sherry Smugler (DMGIS), Carmen Socknat (Victoria), Eva Spevak (Robarts), Sarah Sung (Fisher), Stephanie Swift (OISE/UT), Josy Visscher (Robarts), Nancy Wesson (Victoria)

1. Approval of Minutes of meeting March 22nd 2005; Business arising

Approved as written. Business arising:

- Concerning the creation of authority records in Workflows: Alastair Boyd (Robarts) reported that Thomas Chan (ITS) has updated the library policy for Robarts in Sirsi so that the identifier CaOTU is now inserted automatically in **040** and **64X** fields when anyone proposes an authority using a Robarts login. Any other cataloguing department who wants to use this feature can notify Alastair or Elizabeth Black (CDC); then we can submit a list for Tom to update all interested parties at once.
- Another issue with proposing authorities: the default "authorization level" with level 2 logins is PROVISIONAL instead of AUTHORIZED. How can this be changed? Alastair said this needed to be done by ITS since it appears to be connected to the login. He and Elizabeth will look into this further and send round a message to CatInfo.
- Tangentially, the question arose whether the bib record heading update still runs whenever an older authority record is overlaid with an updated version. I.e., does the nightly routine still go through the database updating all occurrences in bib records of the old authorized form with the new one? As far as we know nothing has changed about this. Alastair said he will keep track of a few such updates over the next few weeks, just to make sure.

2. Report from the Campus Database Co-ordinator

(a) Juvenile Subject headings

Elizabeth Black (CDC) reported that the LC Juvenile Subject authority records have been removed from our subject authority file. The validation policy for such headings (650 with 2nd indicator 1) in bib records has been adjusted so that they are no longer subject to validation.

(b) Canadian Subject headings

In the past we have applied Canadian subject headings where no adequate LCSH term exists. In a number of cases LC has created a heading after we first applied the Canadian heading. For these, Elizabeth has been updating bib records so as to use the new(er) LCSH heading instead. She asks that cataloguers do not import / create / apply Canadian headings except for those special cases where LC has not already created a suitable heading. In such cases she asks that cataloguers submit requests or suggestions to her. She will send round an updated list of such Canadian headings that we can use.

Question: Will Canadian headings validate in Workflows if an authority is record is added to the authority file? *Answer:* Yes, they should.

(c) Summary of coding for subject headings

Elizabeth handed round a chart summarizing the coding of 2nd indicators and "system / thesaurus" fixed field codes for different types of headings. It also includes instructions for how these are to be treated in our catalogue. [See *Appendix I* below].

The handout instructs us not to copy LCSH records into our authority file since these are loaded in weekly batches. *Question:* Does this also apply to geographical headings even when they are not to be found in the authority file? *Answer:* No, geographical heading authorities (for **651s**) are an exception; missing ones should be copied in from SmartPORT

because they appear to be distributed with the name authority file (which we do not load automatically) rather than the subject file. The whole issue of which **6XX** headings are subject (**650s**), geographical (**651s**) or corporate headings (**610s**) is quite confusing; LC has reconsidered a number of these, and continues to move them about. Alastair said there was a list illustrating how LC treats various categories (parks, bridges, etc.) somewhere in Catalogers Desktop, probably the Subject Cataloging Manual. He undertook to dig up and send round the precise reference. [*Note: it is in the Subject Cataloging Manual at H 405: "Establishing Certain Entities in the Name or Subject Authority File"*].

Question: a couple of the group have found that name authority records proposed from **600** fields in the bib record fail to validate **100** or **700** bibliographic fields. Perhaps this is because of fixed field coding. Elizabeth will check into this.

Still on the topic of authority records, there was some discussion about how to establish or update name headings created originally for thesis bib records, where they are given in full with birth dates. Occasionally the author of a thesis goes on to publish something and chooses not to use a middle name, etc. If LC has established the name, then it is best to use that form. Otherwise one has to presume the published name is how the author wishes to be known, and go with that. In such cases, where conflicts exist, it is helpful to make an authority record with a cross-reference for the unpublished full (thesis) form, and a **670** note.

Question: should we also update conflicting names in **720** fields in "T-space" records if we come across them? Alastair suggested that since field **720** is expressly used for all types of "uncontrolled" names, "that have not been formulated according to cataloging rules" (Cf MARC21 manual)—and since in any case these records are not MARC21 catalogue records—the answer should be no. Elizabeth pointed out that such distinctions (MARC21 versus Dublin Core, "controlled" versus "uncontrolled") are of little concern to users of the database, and that their point of view should be considered. Alastair agreed to canvas the Reference Services committee for their opinions.

3. Limits to multiple 020 fields

Alastair reported on a few "continuation" records created by Robarts which have swelled to grotesque proportions with the addition of ISBNs for every volume in an ongoing series. (In some cases of co-publications, there are *two* ISBNs for each volume). This creates a cluttered OPAC display and makes for Workflows editing problems; and once the number of **020s** exceeds 150 there are Sirsi system / indexing problems as well. Are other libraries also dealing with this? Most other libraries do not find it necessary to add this many ISBNs. Are they really a useful access point to a record once there are 100 or more of them? The group expressed considerable doubt. However, since Robarts book selectors frequently have standing orders for these titles, they (the selectors) may be able to explain why all these ISBNs are needed. Again, Alastair undertook to ask the Reference Services group about this as well.

4. Removing records from AMICUS

Arthur Smith (*ROM*) has recently checked on this with Library and Archives Canada, and passed the information on to Elizabeth. Apparently LAC proposes to give any contributing library the power (via an "over the phone" tutorial) to remove holdings from AMICUS titles. In other words, the onus is on the library in question to update AMICUS whenever they remove titles from the local collection and catalogue. This will be a concern for four or five libraries represented at CAUG meetings. We will get the procedural details from the National Library or Arthur. The related question of removing holdings from RLG and OCLC is a bridge we will cross when we come to it: Susan Cozzi (*ITS*) pointed out that we have yet to finish working out how to load our holdings in the first place.

5. Central Library use of ProQuest thesis records

Mary Ruscillo (*Robarts*) summarized for the group the procedures being followed at Robarts when using ProQuest records. In the event that Campus libraries have already catalogued their copy of a thesis first, Robarts will transfer their holdings, local notes and LC subjects into the ProQuest record before dropping the original one so that only one record exists in Sirsi. It would be helpful if the departmental libraries creating the first records were consistent in their choice of fields for local notes. However, some do not participate in CAUG meetings or subscribe to CatInfo, so negotiations between such departments and Robarts may be necessary.

6. "In Process" records from Central Library automated searching

Alastair amplified his e-mail notification from May 17th about "IN PROCESS" as a home location on certain records for recent material for Robarts, Gerstein, and Engineering. Robarts is using a method of automated batch searching based on ISBNs from Vendor File records. The Sirsi catalogue is searched first, followed by LC and various other targets. Records found in this way which are not already in Sirsi are batch loaded with the home location IN_PROCESS. Such records should be finished off by a cataloguer within two weeks of loading, at which point the location will become STACKS. *Question:* Since the search is only by ISBN, might there not be a risk of loading duplicate records in cases where an existing Sirsi record has no ISBN? *Answer:* This process is being used for brand new English DSO material only, so any existing records are almost certain to include the ISBN. Mary Ruscillo added that the cataloguers who finish off these books in Workflows do a title search, so any duplication would be discovered at that point.

7. CAUG membership on the Reference Services Committee

Since our last meeting, the membership of the Reference Services Committee has been revised to include an ex officio representative from the Cataloguing and Authorities Users Group. Alastair has been serving as this member for the time being. If CAUG wished to choose someone else to do this, or (at Elizabeth's suggestion) someone to serve as an alternate, then volunteers were asked to send Alastair an e-mail after the meeting.

8. Other business

- A question for our group has come from Robarts reference concerning the difficulty of searching the OPAC for e-resources by "call number" (i.e. EIR resource number). These numbers are placed in the call number field for all bib records generated by ITS from new EIR listings. There have been variations in the prefix to the number and the "shelving scheme" (ALPHANUM or ASIS) employed, which frustrate efforts to retrieve items successfully by what on the face of it should be a quick and precise search. Because these call numbers are not created by cataloguers, there is little our group can do directly about this. Elizabeth will check with ITS about the options for updating these call numbers to make them consistent.
- Susan Cozzi (ITS) informed the group that the AV Library has a new official name: Media Commons. From now on this is the name that will show in the OPAC. In Workflows the drop-down list will continue to say AVLIBRARY until changes are made in August. A new location, "Media Archives", is to be added for the cold storage facility.

The next meeting will be scheduled for later in the summer. Details to follow.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45.

Appendix I

Coding of Subject Headings in the Union Catalogue

The second indicator value signifies the subject thesaurus in the following fields: 600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 655. Most of our subject headings will be coded in 650 fields with second indicator value 0, for LC subject headings. Other possibilities are given in the table below.

Subject heading system	6XX 2 nd indicator	Used in our catalogue	Authorities
LCSH	0	In original and derived records	Sys/Thes (008/11) value 'a'
Children's headings	1	In some derived records only; no need to delete	Sys/Thes (008/11) value 'b' Records no longer in our authority file
MeSH (NLM medical headings)	2	In derived records for Gerstein, Mount Sinai, etc.; do not delete	Sys/Thes (008/11) value 'c' No records in our authority file
Local	4	Do not use	n/a
Canadian subject headings	5	Use only those where an authority record has been created	Sys/Thes (008/11) value 'k'
Répertoire de vedettes-matière	6	Do not use; delete from derived records	Sys/Thes (008/11) value 'v' No records in our authority file
Other source of subject term	7	Use with 655 field when coding genre terms	n/a

Here are some reminders about our subject heading practice based on the CDC Subject Heading Guidelines originally issued in September 1995:

- Do not copy subject authority records from LC into our authority file. LCSH records are loaded weekly into our system.
- Do not create CANMARC subject authority records. Notify the CDC if you think a CANMARC heading is required.
- Delete 653 fields if the access they provide is too broad to be useful, provided there is at least one other adequate subject heading in the record.
- For locally-assigned subject headings, use the 690 field. The indicators are blank and only subfield |a is defined.

CDC

7 June 2005