

# Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities Users' Group Meeting November 15, 2005, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 a.m.

*Present:* Elizabeth Black (CDC), Alastair Boyd (Robarts), Susan Cozzi (ITS), Helen He (Dentistry), Jack Howard (ROM), Diana Liang (UTSC), P.J MacDougall (Massey), Nadia Moro (FIS), Remi Pulwer (SMC), Stephen Qiao (East Asian), Sergio Quibus (OISE/UT), H. Rashid (Law), Sirpa Ruotsalainen (Trinity), Arthur Smith (ROM), Carmen Socknat (Victoria), Eva Spevak (Robarts), Stephanie Swift (OISE/UT)

*Regrets:* John Fodi (Music)

## 1. Election of Chair

Since there were no other nominees, Alastair Boyd (Robarts) agreed to continue as Chair for another year.

## 2. Approval of Minutes of meeting September 20<sup>th</sup> 2005

Approved as written.

## 3. Business arising

No business not already on the agenda.

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

### (a) MARC templates and displays in Sirsi Workflows

Elizabeth Black (CDC) said she has modified the Workflows template for MARC holdings records, so as to eliminate all fields except **852** and **866**. This is so that cataloguers do not inadvertently use the **863** field for **866** information. At the request of a couple of group members she undertook to add **867** and **868** fields to the template.

*Question (from Law Library):* Re MARC holdings, could the group agree on some guidelines for a consistent way to handle multiple copies in multiple locations in MARC holdings records? *Answer:* This was discussed at a meeting about two years ago. Since MARC holdings records were new to us at the time, no consensus was reached. Alastair said he would review what was said at the time; he asked that H. Rashid (Law) send him a "worst case" example of complex holdings. We want to choose a method that will produce the clearest OPAC display, while remaining MARC-compliant.

Returning to her report, Elizabeth said she has also updated the fixed fields display in Workflows: she has changed some of the labels, and asked Sirsi to remove obsolete fields and add some missing ones.

### (b) MARC coding outline

Elizabeth has also revised the MARC Bibliographic coding outline to bring it up to date. It now describes the Sirsi rather than the DRA MARC conventions. This was prompted by the Hospital libraries, who need something as they begin to put records in Sirsi. However, Elizabeth will send copies to any other campus library that requests it, and Alastair will also put it on the Cataloguing web page. It is almost ready to print: if anyone wants something added to the current outline, please notify Elizabeth as soon as possible. Next on the list is the Authority Coding outline.

*Question:* Re MARC coding, for field **041** LC is now repeating the subfield |a for each language code instead of stringing all codes in a single subfield. What should we be doing? *Answer:* This field was redefined a few years ago so that each code now requires a subfield; so we should follow the new coding practice. The supplementary question arose: which of the possible subfields we should be including? Elizabeth suggested that coding any applicable subfield fully and correctly would be the best policy. Another question: if Sirsi

indexes all codes present in the **041**, then coding for something esoteric like a table of contents in a language different from the text might produce unhelpful results for those who limit catalogue searches by language. Elizabeth said she will consult an e-mail she has saved from a Sirsi programmer explaining how this indexing works.

(c) *Name-title indexing and validation for combined 100 plus 240 fields*

A new feature in Sirsi allows us to index and validate the **100** plus **240** combination as a name-title heading. (Until now, only name-title added entries (**700** with subfield **lt**) have been indexed this way in Sirsi). Elizabeth has been testing this, and found that the validation only works when there are actual matching name-title authority records. If there are not, then the name (**1XX**) alone does not validate. While Sirsi investigates this, they have said it is OK to proceed with indexing the **100+240** as a name-title heading, without implementing the authority control component. ITS will do this indexing over the Christmas break.

(d) *Serials concatenation*

Thanks to some volunteers from this group, the final list of duplicate serial titles (serials with two or more bib records) is almost complete. A meeting with ITS to plan the next step is imminent.

(e) *Hospital libraries*

Records from the new hospital libraries (Baycrest and Bloorview MacMillan) have started to go in. Cataloguers from these libraries will be getting some training from Joe Cox at FIS.

## 5. Report from ITS (Susan Cozzi)

- Susan Cozzi (*ITS*) expanded on the subject of the Hospital libraries. Baycrest and Bloorview MacMillan have been adding holdings to existing records. Efforts are being made to ensure proper quality control for new records. In addition to the training from FIS mentioned by Elizabeth, they are making use of Sirsi's Review File feature. The idea is that someone, as yet undetermined, can review all records batch-loaded into this file, and then load them into the actual database. *Question*: will it be clear in the OPAC that holdings at Hospitals are not available to students or faculty? *Answer*: Yes, through the same device already used for a few other libraries including UTS. I.e., a link to the library "usage policy" is provided as part of the library name in the list of holdings, which will alert users to restrictions on access.
- Susan has asked Marc Lalonde (*ITS*) to provide a link to the CAUG minutes via the Staff Intranet. It is hoped that having a direct link from the drop-down list of committees at the bottom of the Intranet page will make this documentation easier to find.

## 6. Feedback from the Reference Services Committee

Stephanie Swift (*OISE/UT*) attended the last Reference Services meeting on CAUG's behalf, to ask for their views on deleting **856** links we find in LC records to the online Table of Contents, in cases where the bib record already has a **505** contents note. According to her report, at first the consensus was that we should get rid of the **856** linking to the table of contents when there is also a **505** in the bib record. The fact that the **505** is sometimes more complete and accurate than the **856** link was discussed. There was a suggestion that the cataloguer should make the decision about whether to keep the **856** or the **505**, based on which one is more accurate, but she explained that this would take too much of the cataloguer's time. Then Sian Meikle (*ITS*) said that it might be possible to have the "Online" button which appears in various places in the OPAC show what is actually being linked to, based on the **3** of the **856** (in the example we looked at, **3** said "Table of contents") Apparently this would have to be done for all **856s**, it couldn't be done for just some of them. Sian said it would take perhaps two weeks to make this change and have it available for us to look at in the test database. People seemed to think that this would be the best solution, so Ref Services left it that they will see what can be done. Therefore CAUG will also wait and see, before trying once more to reach a decision.

## **7. Web version of Catalogers' Desktop**

Since LC has discontinued the CD-ROM version of Catalogers' Desktop we have had to switch our subscription over to the online version. The last disc we received was in May, so access to this is just starting to expire across campus. Alastair has already sent a message to most of the libraries affected, with the URL, username and password for connecting to the web version. It is currently not possible to avoid passwords by registering IP addresses the way we do with Classification Web. We are still trying to determine the appropriate number of simultaneous access licenses to get. Please let Alastair know if you get "denial" messages saying all the available licenses are in use, so he can request additional access.

## **8. Relator codes in subfield |4 for thesis supervisors**

One of the campus libraries that catalogues theses before they are sent to ProQuest recently enquired about making **700** added entries for thesis supervisors, with a relator code in subfield **|4**. It turns out there is now a code for this: "**|4ths**". Because the meeting time was almost up there was no time to discuss this properly, but Elizabeth pointed out that this practice does not conform to the suggested guidelines for thesis records, and that such entries would (a) need to be authority controlled and (b) be lost once the ProQuest records overlaid the original ones. Sirsi does not currently make use of relator codes for limiting searches, and in any case, keyword searches on the name plus "advisor" can retrieve such names from the notes in the ProQuest records. Alastair felt there was a larger issue to do with the inconsistent presence of all relator codes in our catalogue: LC uses them, as do many OCLC libraries, but no-one at U of T seems to be putting them in original records. He will investigate how these codes work in other systems, and perhaps we can revisit the topic at a future meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 10<sup>th</sup>, at 10:00 a.m. in Robarts Room 4049. Agenda to follow.

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