

## **Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities User Group Meeting March 9, 2004, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 am**

*Present:* Elizabeth Black (CDC), Maria Angelina Borges (SMC), Alastair Boyd (Robarts), Mary Canning (UTM), Susan Cozzi (ITS), Sr. Margaret Ann Cuthbert (SMC), Mudite Eksteins (Robarts), Astrida Ezergailis (Regis), Carmen Garcia (Mt. Sinai), Elizabeth Glover (SMC), Diana Liang (UTSC), Kate McNairn (Media Commons), Nadia Moro (FIS), H. Rashid (Law), Sirpa Ruotsalainen (Trinity), Mary Ruschillo (Robarts), Carmen Socknat (Victoria), Eva Spevak (Robarts), Georgia Vastaki (OISE), Josy Visscher (Robarts), Nancy Wesson (Victoria)

### **1. Approval of Minutes of January 20, 2004**

Approved as written.

### **2. Business Arising from the Minutes**

- (i) *Copy Record notes for non-circulating collections:* Since our last meeting Sian Meikle (ITS) has been discussing with Reference Services the idea of automated copy-level notes to indicate non-circulating material. She is confident it could be done. In certain circumstances there is no obvious alternative for showing catalogue users that specific materials do not circulate. However, Alastair Boyd (Robarts) felt that because creating and/or maintaining notes at the copy level is the most labour-intensive way imaginable for handling this, it should be a last resort, even if ITS can automatically add such notes to existing records.

In cases where an entire collection is non-circulating, and the Location Code for that collection is specific to a single library, then the OPAC description of the location code could be modified to say "non-circulating." A hypothetical case: the Music Library does not (yet) have a location code for its sound recording collection, but when (if) it does, then the OPAC description for the location could read e.g. "Recording Archive (non-circulating)." Notes at this higher level need only be created or adjusted in one place, instead of copy by copy.

Elizabeth Black (CDC) reminded the group that this whole issue was a public services / reference concern, and so Ref Info should be partners in offering advice to cataloguers and ITS on the method and wording of such notes, or even the need for them. Carmen Socknat (Victoria) pointed out that although certain Pratt Library special collections do not circulate, users have not been complaining that the catalogue doesn't say so. On the other hand, several other members of the group said the omission of such information was creating additional work in public services, especially in dealing with requests / holds. Susan Cozzi (ITS) said that a future version of VDX will check the copy record so as not to permit loan requests for non-circulating items.

H. Rashid (Law) said in passing that he found 505 contents notes were not displaying for some records. Elizabeth said that all public notes have been set to display, but she would double check this with Sian. *[Note: Sian confirmed after the meeting that 505 notes were displaying correctly for all formats].*

- (ii) *MARC Holdings training*: Carmen told the group that all those interested in learning more about MARC holdings and serials should contact Carla Hagstrom (*ITS*) ([carla.hagstrom@utoronto.ca](mailto:carla.hagstrom@utoronto.ca)) and ask to be placed on the serials users list. This will keep people informed about problems, training, etc. Carmen agreed to send a preliminary message to CatInfo with more details.
- (iii) *Sirsi Reports training*: Although this topic was not on the agenda, Alastair thought this was an appropriate place to discuss the Reports training that Tom Chan (*ITS*) is offering. Elizabeth said that this would be a more of a general overview, rather than specific to the Cataloguing module. Carmen recommended that interested users do some homework, deciding what reports they need to run. Tom can demystify the report process, which will greatly assist us in experimenting with, and getting a feel for, the great number of available reports (they are not lavishly documented).

### 3. Report from the Campus Database Co-ordinator

- (i) Elizabeth has continued working with Wen Ran (*ITS*) on moving serials 090 subfield **ld** information into MARC holdings records. This is proving to be a complex process for a certain category of “problem” serials where there are multiple holdings already attached which do not match the 090 fields.
- (ii) So far Elizabeth has a list of Holdings Codes to be corrected for Robarts, UTM, and Music. She will continue checking with other libraries about their use of the location PERIODICALS.
- (iii) ITS can pare down the list of Item Types displaying in Workflows and the OPAC so as to suppress those we have agreed not to use (AV, AV-EQUIP, ILL-BOOK, MAGAZINE, NEW-BOOK, NEWSPAPER, REF-BOOK). Furthermore, the display can be controlled by Library, so that e.g. OISE-specific types will show only to OISE.

Kate McNairn (*Media Commons*) mentioned the pending Booking Function—associated with it is an item “ROOM” and a location “Media Desk”. She will consult further with Elizabeth concerning the database records that her department needs to add for use in conjunction with the booking module.

### 4. Update on SmartPORT databases

Alastair reported that the CANMARC files are *almost* here. That is, ITS has now provided and set up the server, and is currently loading the records. Once the base file and all the updates we have are loaded, Tom will add CANMARC authority and CANMARC bibliographic databases to the SmartPORT list. Alastair will also send an e-mail to CatInfo to notify everyone, with instructions on updating the “liso/liso” configuration settings for use with NLC control numbers.

Alastair has asked Maks Okrasa (*Robarts*) and Tom about changing the order of the SmartpORT database list. As Arthur Smith (*ROM*) said at our last meeting, it would be helpful if the most commonly used targets (LC, UTL, OCLC, RLIN, AGC) appeared as a group at the top of the list, rather than scattered alphabetically. However, it seems this will not be easy to achieve. Even if an alphabetical prefix (A-, B-, C-, etc.) were added to the database names to control the display order, the SmartPORT configuration appears not to allow database names to be edited after they are created. The descriptions can be changed, but apparently not the names—and it is the names which the system sorts alphabetically. If this is true, then the only way to re-order the list will be to recreate it

from scratch. This would be a painstaking and time-consuming process, and probably not ITS's first priority. If Tom finds another way, he will notify Alastair or Elizabeth.

Susan Cozzi reported that Sirsi has reloaded and re-indexed the DRANet (now "SmartSource") LCMARC and LCAUTH files. If cataloguers still encounter instances where LC records can be found in OCLC but not in the SmartSource LC files, please give Susan examples. Alastair added that there is currently a problem doing ISBN searches against the SmartSource LCMARC file. Sirsi has told us the problem lies with our configuration of SmartPORT, and is working with Tom to correct it.

## **5. AGenT — the new search interface for AG-Canada**

Alastair reminded the group that by the end of the month AG Canada will have discontinued the existing "Impact / MARCIt" web access to AGC, replacing it with the new "AGent" interface. Access through SmartPORT will remain unchanged, however. Anyone who does not wish to use SmartpORT will have to become acquainted with AGenT over the next couple of weeks. AG Canada has offered to provide a demo / training session. Susan Cozzi can arrange this for us if there is sufficient demand. So far there have been few requests for such a session.

## **6. Subfield |5[NUC code] in local notes**

Back in the days of DRA, Elizabeth pointed out that adding subfield \$5 with your library NUC code (e.g. \$5CaOTTC for Trinity) to a local note failed to establish its authorship for catalogue users. First, the subfield did not display in the Public Catalogue; and second, the code was meaningless to the public anyway. Therefore, she requested that we mention the library name as part of the note itself. Once adopted, this practice seemed to many of us to render the \$5 subfield redundant, so we stopped adding it. However, some of us are still using it even in the new Sirsi era, and Carmen (among others) is wondering why.

Elizabeth said that the system makes no use of it, and local 590 or 592 fields should not be exported to other systems. So in her opinion, cataloguers, having made sure the library name is in the body of the note, should *not* add the subfield \$5. This feeling was shared by most of the group. Alastair added that the issue can often be avoided by using copy-level public notes for as many copy-specific details as possible ("lacks t.p." etc.)—this is technically the "correct" place for such information.

The related issue of which 590 notes some libraries need to put in the bib record, and why, is a potentially contentious one, and time did not allow for a thorough discussion. We will return to it at a future meeting.

## **7. Other Business**

None.

***Meeting adjourned at 11:40.***