

Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities User Group Meeting March 22, 2005, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 am

Present: Elizabeth Black (CDC), Alastair Boyd, chair (Robarts), Michael Bramah (SMC), Mary Canning (UTM), Susan Cozzi (ITS), Mudite Eksteins (Robarts), John Fodi (Music), Helen He (Dentistry), Diana Liang (UTSC), Vicky Lynham (Mt. Sinai), P.J. MacDougall (Massey), Sergio Quibus (OISE/UT), H. Rashid (Law), Sirpa Ruotsalainen (Trinity), Sherry Smuggler (DMGIS), Eva Spevak (Robarts), Stephanie Swift (OISE/UT), Chris Tucker (Knox), Josy Visscher (Robarts), Nancy Wesson (Victoria). *Guests:* Rachael Agnew (Robarts Project), Felicity Pickup (Robarts Ref.)

1. Approval of Minutes of meeting November 16th 2004; Business arising

Approved as written. Business arising:

- At the last meeting Alastair Boyd (Robarts) had undertaken to find out if the CONSER database of serial records was available directly from LC or NLC, in addition to OCLC. (Such records would be useful for upgrading "master" records as part of the Serials Concatenation project, but it would be too expensive to re-search so many titles in OCLC). Alastair could find no published acknowledgement that CONSER exists as a file independently from OCLC. However, records from contributing libraries, including LC and NLC, are certainly available directly from the library in question, using SmartPORT, as an alternative to the expense of OCLC. This is not as convenient as being able to search in just one place, of course.
- Concerning the automatic insertion of Library "NUC" codes in **040** fields and subfield **5** when proposing authorities in Workflows: there seems to be no better way to test if this will work than by going ahead and setting it up on a trial basis. We will start by associating code CaOTU with the ROBARTS library policy, and if this works, other campus libraries may choose to join in.
- At the November meeting Alastair had warned that **440** fields with initial articles would not validate in Workflows. In the minutes he had retracted this and said that as long as the non-filing indicator was correctly set there was no problem. It turns out this is not true either. The validation routine is case-sensitive, so the filing indicator has to be set, AND the first filing word has to be capitalized, for the validation to work. I.e. if the first filing word is a proper (or German) noun, the series will validate; not otherwise. So we are back to the choices discussed last time: omitting the article from **440** fields, or using **490** for the heading with the article, and adding an **830** for the form used in the authority record.

2. Report from the Campus Database Co-ordinator

(a) *NO_ITEM* location

Elizabeth Black (CDC) reported that 18,000 records remain with location NO_ITEM. This "location" was assigned during the Sirsi migration to anything lacking an item record in DRA. But there are recent records carrying this bogus location in the catalogue, which means someone, somewhere, is choosing this location on purpose for post-migration cataloguing. It might be improperly-trained circulation staff. Elizabeth has asked Tom Chan (ITS) if he could remove NO_ITEM from the list of options, but this may not be possible as long as it remains in use. In any case, we should recognize *new* records with this location as errors.

(b) *Title Control* keys

There are a number of Sirsi records with Title Control keys lacking the proper prefix (**l i s** or **o**). The load routine inserts this automatically; we must do likewise when creating original records, or the duplicate-matching process will fail. Certain OCLC records carry NLC control numbers in the **010** field with prefix "cn", so after loading the title control numbers will begin "lcn". The proper MARC21 field for an NLC control number is **016**. Even though OCLC may start using this in future, we will not be able to use it as a title control number until the Sirsi software is amended to allow it.

(c) *Theses update*

Elizabeth read the following report:

“There are now more than 500 records for U of T Ph.D. and Master's theses provided by ProQuest loaded into the catalogue. The bibliographic description is for the paper copy but there is an EIR call number and an **856** pointing to the EIR page for the ProQuest online version. Most of the theses in the current load seem to be from 2004. These records were loaded according to specs I provided to Max Okrasa (*Robarts*). Their Title Control Keys are the ISBNs provided through ProQuest. These records are characterized by long summary (**520**) notes containing the thesis abstract. They have general index terms provided by ProQuest which we have put in a key-word indexed **653** field.

“Here is an abbreviated sample in a labelled display:

Online resource 80303

Leader: am 0n
key: AAINQ91776
Date/time stamp: 20041122101255.5
Fixed field data: 041122s2004 onc eng d
ISBN: 0612917762
Local system #: EIR-080303
039: ws
Cataloguing source: UnM UnM CaOTU
Personal Author: Quan, Vinh Kien.
Title: Analysis of the advanced intelligent network vendor-telco-customer supply network using mathematical programming models.
Publication info: 2004.
Physical descrip: 187 leaves.
General Note: Adviser: J. Scott Rogers.
Dissertation note: Thesis (Ph.D.)--University of Toronto, 2004.
Access restriction: Electronic version licensed for access by U. of T. users.
Indexed by: Source: Dissertation Abstracts International, Volume: 65-05, Section: B, page: 2604.
Summary: In the North American telephone system, applications such as toll free, calling name & number delivery as well as other enhanced telephony services are offered via the Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) architecture.
Index term: Operations Research.
Online access: Connect to resource
Held by: GERSTEIN E_RESOURCE

(Displaying 2 of 2 volumes)

| GERSTEIN | CALL NUMBER | COPY | MATERIAL | LOCATION |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | theses MEENG 2004 Ph.D. 11329 | 1 | BOOK | THESES |
| | | 2 | MICROFORM | MICROTEXT |

| E_RESOURCE | CALL NUMBER | COPY | MATERIAL | LOCATION |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 2 | Online resource 80303 | 1 | E_RESOURCE | ONLINE |

“This record has been updated by the Central Library with call numbers for their paper and microform copies.

“I believe that ProQuest will be supplying a cumulating file of thesis records every 6 months. The records will be matched on ISBN on load so that duplicates will not be added. I do not think there is any plan to add any records for retrospective holdings.

“There are of course several issues for cataloguers. Some libraries acquire and catalogue U of T theses well in advance of Proquest. Any catalogue records done for these will not be overlaid by the ProQuest records, but they will not be found and matched, either. This means there will be duplicate records. Because the ProQuest records do not have standard subject headings, and may not have standardized forms of name, it is possible that a user searching by anything other than title may not find both records.

“The best way to deal with this problem is to enhance the ProQuest record once it is loaded, with the addition of local call numbers and subject headings if possible. Nothing should be deleted from the ProQuest record, though corrections should be made. The Title Control Key based on the ISBN should never be changed, as it is the mechanism whereby the loading of duplicate records will be avoided.”

In the subsequent discussion, Elizabeth said that Reference staff might be able to help by suggesting that users search again by title to see if an electronic version is available whenever they find a “paper” record for a potentially interesting item.

(d) Serials concatenation

A FIS practicum student was working last term under Elizabeth’s supervision to find the duplicates in a list of 200,000 serial titles. After working through the first 60,000 removing unique titles he was able to reduce those 60,000 titles to a list of ca. 15,000 duplicates. The MARC holdings records — to which are linked the serials check-in controls — remain a stumbling block to concatenation, since it is impossible to use Workflows to transfer holdings from one bib record to another. As long as only one record among several duplicates has MARC holdings attached, there is no difficulty in selecting it as the “master” record. But when two or more duplicates have MARC holdings, ITS will have to find a way to move holdings to a single record. We can’t even decide to begin with those titles for which only one MARC holdings records exists, because there is no way to search for MARC holdings in Workflows. Again, ITS will have to generate a list of such titles in order for us to start working on them first.

Catalogue users would greatly appreciate concatenation of the multiple records for electronic journals, as well. This has already been dealt with on the EIR pages: a single “Read more” page provides links to all the vendors for a title with multiple sources, with indications of coverage, etc. However, plans to achieve the same thing in the catalogue may be further complicated by the addition of check-in records to each duplicate bib record.

3. Report from ITS (Susan Cozzi)

Susan summarized for the group the recent sad history of problems with RLIN access, arising from the recent migration of the database and servers by RLG. She reminded the group that SmartPORT access has temporarily been pointed back to the old database; it will remain that way until we are sure the new database, accessed through the RLIN21 client, is stable and reliable. She urges all RLIN users to inform her of any new or continuing problems with RLIN access.

4. Sirsi “Record Format” and “Rec_Type” codes

Alastair has prepared a table illustrating the correlations between “record type” fixed field codes and Sirsi’s “Record Format” options on the Control Tab. This is for the benefit of those of us who don’t do a great deal of original cataloguing for non-print material, and may be puzzled by some

of the Sirsi terminology. This table is already posted on the Robarts Cataloguing web page in the list of Guides & Manuals (<http://www.library.utoronto.ca/robarts/cataloguing/guides/>) but he undertook to include it in the minutes as well. As follows:

Sirsi Record Formats and Rec_Type Codes

Sirsi Workflows uses the **Record Format** settings from the *Control* tab to determine the fixed fields that are displayed in the Bib record, rather than basing this on the fixed field **Rec_Type** code, the way DRA did. For non-book items this means that even when we input the correct code in the *Bib* record, it is still up to us to choose the right Record Format in the *Control* tab. The table below shows which **Rec_Type** codes (from MARC21) belong to which Sirsi **Record Formats**.

Use the **Record Formats** (*Control tab*) from the first column corresponding to the **Rec_Type** fixed field codes (*Bib tab*) in the second column.

| Record Format | Rec_Type | Material |
|----------------------|-------------------|--|
| MARC | a, t | language material or manuscript language material |
| MUSIC | c, d, i, j | notated music, manuscript notated music, nonmusical sound recording, or musical sound recording |
| MAP | e, f | cartographic material or manuscript cartographic material |
| MRDF | m [etc.] * | computer software (including programs, games, fonts), numeric data, computer-oriented multimedia, online systems or services |
| VM | g, k, o, r | projected medium, two-dimensional nonprojectable graphic, kit, or three-dimensional artifact or naturally occurring object |
| MANUSCRIPT | p | mixed material |

(The SERIALS format is used when the **Bib_Level** fixed field code is **s, b, or i**.)

Note:* for MRDF items (electronic resources), the **Rec_Type code “**m**” is now assigned only for the material described in the corresponding right-hand column above. The MARC21 manual says:

... if there is a significant aspect that causes it to fall into another [Rec_Type] category, code for that significant aspect (e.g., vector data that is cartographic is not coded as numeric but as cartographic). Other classes of electronic resources are coded for their most significant aspect (e.g. language material, graphic, cartographic material, sound, music, moving image). In case of doubt or if the most significant aspect cannot be determined, consider the item a computer file.

Thus an e-book has Rec_Type “**a**” and a photo CD is coded “**k**” (two-dimensional nonprojectable graphic), and so on. The **006** control field is then used to add the codes describing the computer file aspect (e.g. record type “**m**” and file type “**d**”).

In the subsequent discussion Alastair emphasized that the question does not arise when loading records through SmartPORT (or with batch loading). The load program automatically sets the correct Record Format based on the Rec_Type code of any incoming record.

Another point arose concerning the **006** field which is added for coding the computer file aspects of electronic resources whose “significant aspect” is for text or pictures, etc. Sirsi shows the **006** as a second set of fixed fields below the first, in order to make them easier to read and edit. So if anyone loads a record and finds it has two sets of fixed fields, it is not an error. When creating original records which require an **006**, on the Defaults template page you should use the list where it says “Add **006** for:” to select the right Format (e.g. MRDF).

5. Switching to the OCLC Connexion client

As of May 1st the “Passport for Windows” access to OCLC will cease, to be replaced by the OCLC “Connexion” Client. Alastair is writing a short guide to supplement the OCLC online tutorial and documentation, and will be giving Robarts cataloguers a brief training session next month. He will post the guide to the Cataloguing web page, and suggests comparing notes and sharing tips etc. with anyone else who is doing something similar.

6. Other business

A couple of proposals have been made during the past year about adding MARC holdings to indicate summary holdings (field **866**) for large circulating multi-volume sets, the same way some of us already do for non-circulating reference sets. This would duplicate information also available from the Vol/Copy portion of the record, but could be useful to catalogue users especially where there are gaps or irregularities in volume numbering. Consistency in the catalogue is always desirable, but Elizabeth doubted whether a campus-wide policy could be achieved: there is no reasonable way either to insist all libraries do this, or to forbid any library from adopting this practice. Since we had no more time at this meeting, the group agreed to defer further discussion.

The next meeting is scheduled for mid-May. Details to follow.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.