Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities User Group Meeting
May 4, 2004, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 am

Present: Elizabeth Black *(CDC),* Maria Angelina Borges *(SMC),* Alastair Boyd *(Robarts),* Julia Callaby *(Robarts),* Mary Canning *(UTM),* Joyce Chyrski *(Robarts CDD),* Susan Cozzi (*ITS*) Sr. M.A. Cuthbert *(SMC),* Bernie Disonglo *(DMGIS),* Mudite Eksteins *(Robarts),* Astrida Ezergailis *(Regis),* Steve Greiner *(Robarts Serials),* Diana Liang *(UTSC),* Felicity Pickup *(Robarts Ref.),* Stephen Qiao *(East Asian),* H. Rashid *(Law),* Sirpa Ruotsalainen *(Trinity),* Sherry Smugler *(DMGIS),* Eva Spevak *(Robarts),* Stephanie Swift *(OISE),* Josy Visccher *(Robarts),* Nancy Wesson *(Victoria)*

1. Minutes of March 9, 2004

Approved as written. No business arising.

2. Report from the Campus Database Co-ordinator

(i) Elizabeth Black (*CDC*)has continued working with Wen Ran Zhang (*ITS*) on the Holding Codes problem, and the mismatching home locations in Holdings versus Item records for serial titles at various libraries. She prepared a summary of the problem, submitted last month to CLCG, which is attached as an *Appendix* to these minutes. Everything is almost ready to go. It is essential that the modification of the afflicted serial Holdings records (field **852** subfield **|c** for Location) and the corresponding Holdings Codes take place at the same time, and that no serials are checked in while the correction process is running. Everyone will be notified when the changes are about to happen.

There are a smaller number of titles with multiple or conflicting Item and Holdings records which cannot be fixed automatically. Wen Ran has made a list of minor problems of multiple or mismatching locations, sorted by library, showing the conflicts along with individual title control numbers. Elizabeth suggests that each library concerned can check record by record to identify and correct the errors. At the meeting Elizabeth distributed copies of the relevant pages to members from Law, OISE, Trinity, SMC, Victoria, UTM and UTSC. She will send the information via e-mail to the remaining libraries not represented at the meeting. Elizabeth reminded the group that in principle there should be *one* primary location for one copy of a title at a given library; the **852** subfield **|z** note can display information such as "Current issues in…" for cases where there is more than one shelving location.

(ii) Elizabeth alerted the group to the impending arrival in the database of records created by the Media Commons for use with the Sirsi Booking Module. These are not really bibliographic records, but use Sirsi-defined MARC records for ROOM and EQUIP (and possibly COMMUNITY, which actually *is* a MARC 21 format). Although these records will be shadowed, some of the fields they use are in the keyword index, so we may come across them from time to time. Susan Cozzi (*ITS*) said that as yet there was only one ROOM record in the database, but more should soon follow. She suggested that samples of ROOM and EQUIP records could be drawn to the group's attention via the CatInfo list, to give us all some idea what to expect.

3. SmartPORT

(i) Alastair Boyd (*Robarts*) summarized his recent postings to CatInfo about modifying SmartPORT's load options to use National Library numbers as a source for title control keys. This could be done by adding the letter "g" to the "liso/liso" string in the

configuration, which means SmartPORT will check the **001** control number field in records as you load them. (Because Sirsi does not recognize the **016** field as a title control number source, but *does* recognize the **001** field, the **016** was copied to the **001** field as the local CANMARC file was created). However, if SmartPORT is told to inspect **001** fields in incoming records, when you capture a record from a MARION database such as the SmartPORT version of LCMARC there will be cases where *their* DBCN from the 001 will match one of *our* migrated DRA DBCNs for an entirely different item in Sirsi. So for now, it seems best NOT to include the "g" in the SmartPORT configuration. Most books with National Library records will have an ISBN anyway, so the **016/001** number will seldom be actually used.

However, for authority records no such problems arise. The configuration options for authority records should be updated, so that the "Authority control number source" box contains the letters nc.

(ii) The group agreed that AMICUS access to the CANMARC authority file could be removed from SmartPORT now that the records are locally mounted. Alastair will request this update when Tom Chan (*ITS*) returns from vacation next week. At the same time, we will ask him to modify the entry for AMICUS so that all the AMICUS bibliographic databases will be searched rather than just the National Library. In the interests of shortening the list a bit more Alastair had already asked on CatInfo whether we could remove the Duke University entry, and had received no votes either way. However, a couple of group members present at the meeting said they found it useful on occasion. Decision: we will retain it.

Alastair reminded the group that resizing the window with the list of SmartPORT targets makes it possible to show a lot more of the entries: how many depends on individual computer display settings. E.g. a screen resolution of 1024 x 768 will show the whole list when the window is enlarged; 800 x 600 will show a bit less. Once you have dragged the window to a larger size, it will stay that way for the duration of your SmartPORT session.

4. Cataloguing Electronic Resources

A couple of group members have asked about the appropriate call number and Library name to assign when cataloguing an electronic resource such as a website or online document. Stephanie Swift (*OISE*) had a recent example: a guide to education in New Zealand, available only on the web as a PDF file. At present there are no consistent clear policies across campus about how to proceed.

We can divide U of T's electronic resources into two groups: (1) those listed in the EIR database (http://www.library.utoronto.ca/resources/) ; and (2) all the rest. Catalogue records for the first group (EIR indexes, journals, e-books etc.) have a URL in the **856** field that points to the EIR server, from which users can in turn connect to the resource. Such resources are frequently "licensed for use by members of the University of Toronto community". The Library name is E_RESOURCE, and the call number is an accession number generated by EIR in the form "ONLINE RESOURCES 000123". EIR keeps track of the subscription, the licensing, and the URL. If a resource is removed from the EIR list, they remove the catalogue record as well.

Questions abound. Can any campus library ask ITS to add resources to the list, even free ones, possibly of limited interest? (For e-journals etc. there is an online form for requesting a subscription). *Should* such resources be added? Does EIR have any criteria for making such additions? Is the library name E_RESOURCE intended only for EIR material?

If a title is listed in EIR then there is no problem with the call number and Library: EIR will assign the accession number, and the Library is E_RESOURCE. If an online title is *not* part of EIR for whatever reason, there are two schools of thought concerning the holdings information. There is a case to be made for providing at least a partial classification number. At the meeting Alastair could not remember where he had read some guidelines on this, but thought it might be the OCLC Internet Guide. [*It is. See*: http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/cataloging/internetguide/

From part 6, Classification:

A library may choose to use LC classification, DDC, or any other standard scheme, a local system, accession numbering, or no classification. As there are no items to be shelved, one might argue there is no reason to develop any type of shelf-number for these items.

It is helpful for purposes of collection development to include at least the subfield ‡a portion of an LC classification number (or whatever number scheme is used for other materials in the library) in a bibliographic record…. This would omit only the last cutter number that is used for shelf arrangement, and any date of publication. The complete call number may, of course, be provided.

Those users who browse online by call number will be able to find electronic resources by class number in the same way as other materials; if browsing a unified shelf list, all materials are together by class number regardless of format of the material.]

On the other hand, some of our group are already using their own Library name and a generic label "INTERNET" for the call number. They argue that to include any classification number will mislead users of the catalogue into thinking there is something on a shelf, even if the item type is E_RESOURCE, and even if the title is accessible online then and there from the catalogue. It may not be possible to achieve a consensus about this, especially since we will need to consult the views of a wider group than ours. We should consider all the ramifications: foremost for users, as well as for cataloguing and reference departments, and book selectors.

In the meantime, we agree that in many cases it would be desirable to have a listing in EIR as well as the catalogue. At the suggestion of Elizabeth and Susan Cozzi (*ITS*), Alastair will consult ITS (Sian Meikle and Peter Clinton?) about procedures and criteria for adding "free" titles to the EIR list.

5. Report from ITS (Susan Cozzi)

(i) Susan reported that the VAX has left the building. (However ITS has kept some components of sentimental value on display for visitors).

(ii) ITS is now developing customized and individual Workflows log-ins for campus libraries. Libraries will be contacted over the spring and summer about their requirements, both for tweaking existing generic accounts and for adding new ones. Now would be a good time to start thinking about which staff can share accounts, and the specific permissions etc. that should be defined for different levels of access.

6. Other Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.

Appendix: Summary of Holding Code problem by Elizabeth Black (CDC)

Holding Code problem (April 2004)

Holding codes are Sirsi short-cuts used to assign copy-level information at the time a record is loaded into the Sirsi database. The Holding codes are used in the cataloguing, acquisition, and serials modules. Each Holding code provides library, location, item type, and circulation status for items being 'loaded' into Sirsi.

We are not so far as I know currently using the Holding codes in the 949 field of cataloguing records being loaded into Sirsi in batch by the central library. We are using Holding codes for loading orders (Link order line holdings to titles) and in serials control (serials distribution tab).

When an order is loaded into Sirsi, any inconsistencies in the copy-level information generated from the Holding code can be corrected by the cataloguer loading the record.

In serials control, however, the location associated with a particular Holding code is inserted automatically as the location in the MARC holdings record (i.e., in 852 |c). Because the function of the Holding codes was imperfectly understood at the time they were set up, there are many errors in the definition of the codes, and considerable duplication. The Holding codes used for Robarts serials, for example, assign the location PERIODICAL. The actual location for these serials is STACKS.

It is a simple matter to change the definition of a Holding code so that it assigns a different location in the MARC Holdings record. But the system would then create duplicate MARC Holdings records, thinking there are copies in a new location. In the project I am currently working on, we are attempting to identify all the Holding codes assigning incorrect locations. We will then change the location assigned by the Holding code and the corresponding 852 |c so that they match. This needs to be done more or less simultaneously.

I am working from my table of existing Holding codes, and a table provided by ITS of cases where the location in the item record for a serial does not match the location in the Holdings record (852 |c). In some instances, the location in the item record is the wrong one. These locations will be changed as well.

I have been in touch with the libraries which have many occurrences of conflicting locations in their serial records. I am currently working with ITS to test the changes that will need to be made. We will then repeat the process on the live database. For cases where there are fewer than 20 instances of a conflict between the item record and holding location, the plan is to distribute a list of the incorrect records, with instructions on how to fix them, to the libraries affected.