Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities Users' Group Meeting
September 19, Robarts Library Room 4049, 10:00 a.m

Present: Lisa Andrews-Attwater *(Rotman),* Alastair Boyd *(Robarts),* Michael Bramah *(SMC),* Mary Canning *(UTM),* Susie Choi *(UTS),* Joyce Chyrski *(Robarts),* Peter Clinton *(ITS),* John Fodi *(Music),* Carmen Garcia *(Mt. Sinai),* Mary Jaques *(Regis),* Stephen Qiao *(East Asian),* Sergio Quibus *(OISE/UT),* Kathryn Roberts *(Law),* Sirpa Ruotsalainen *(Trinity),* Mary Ruscillo *(Robarts),* Anna Slawek *(Robarts),* Arthur Smith *(ROM),* Sherry Smuggler *(DMGIS),* Carmen Socknat *(Victoria),* Eva Spevak *(Robarts),* Stephanie Swift *(OISE/UT),* Chris Tucker *(Knox),* Lorna Young *(Regis)*

New members: At this meeting Lorna Young (*Regis*) introduced Mary Jaques, the new cataloguer at Regis; and Stephanie Swift (OISE/UT) introduced Susie Choi, the new librarian at UTS.

1. Minutes of / Business Arising from June 13th meeting

Minutes approved as written.

Business arising: the question of reconfiguring SmartPORT so that "author" searches retrieve names from both **100** *and* **700** fields is still pending; Alastair Boyd (*Robarts*) will talk to Tom Chan in ITS about this before our November meeting.

Question: is there any news on the timetable for the next upgrade to Sirsi? *Answer*: Peter Clinton (*ITS*) said that Tom Chan hopes to load the new version on the test server over Thanksgiving. Depending on how well that goes, he might then be able to upgrade the production server over Christmas.

2. Report of temporary substitute "CDC" (*Alastair Boyd*)

(a) In August Wen Ran Zhang (*ITS*) loaded 7361 Coutts records for MyiLibrary into Sirsi*,* in consultation with Sian Meikle (*ITS*), Maks Okrasa (*Robarts*) and Alastair Boyd. A procedure has been established where "profiles" are created for various vendors of MARC records, detailing what fields need to be modified, added, or deleted. These profiles are linked to scripts that Wen Ran uses to do the loads. Whenever new batches of records are acquired, someone from the new "CDC "committee (see next Agenda item) will look at a sample to confirm no profile changes are required, or to propose changes if necessary. The hope is to avoid having to customize scripts every time records need batch loading.

The novelty in the case of this record load: 5302 of them were matched to existing records for print copies which were then updated to provide access to the online version as Added Copies, rather than loading duplicate records. This is in keeping with the revised EIRC guidelines approved by Library Council in 2003, which says that for monographs whose online and print editions are the same, it is sufficient to provide access to the electronic version from the record describing the print. So in this case, only 2059 new records were added, representing those titles not already held in print.

(b) The kind of automated record matching just described depends on control numbers **010** and **020** for its success. It highlights the importance of keeping these numbers specific. I.e. whenever we use a record for a different version or edition as a starting point for a new record, we must delete ALL the elements that refer specifically to the other version. This applies whether making a record for an online version out of a print record, or even a record for a later print version (sometimes it's easier to start with the record for the 1st edition and edit it to make a record for the 2nd edition -- but if so, the numbers [e.g. **010**, **020**] that identify the 1st edition must be removed from the derived record).

(c) The LC/NACO decision to allow updating personal name authority records with death dates has created quite a mess in our catalogue. We already have ca. 1000 LC authorities in our

local authority file that now need updating because of missing death dates, and the number is growing by a couple of hundred a month. OCLC publishes a weekly list available through RSS. These LC authorities need to be re-imported, overlaying the current records, in order to flip the corresponding headings in the bib records. And in the case of bib records with name-title added entries, the flip only works if there was a corresponding name-title authority which can be overlaid. This is all very time-consuming. Alastair is consulting Maks Okrasa about ways to automate the process, but this first requires building an actual MARC database of our local authority file. We hope there will be some progress to report at the next CAUG meeting in November.

(d) Prompted by a reminder from Arthur Smith (*ROM*) in early August, Alastair sent a note to the CatInfo list pointing out that when creating a MARC holdings record for a multi-volume monograph, the default fixed field value "Rec_Type: y" means "serial", and so needs to be changed to "v" for "multipart item holdings". In her cheat-sheet *MARC Holdings for Monographs*, Elizabeth Black also suggests changing the subsequent fixed field "Enc_Lvl" to "3" for records which have only an **866** for summary holdings — which is the case for these kinds of holdings records.

(e) A couple of times over the summer the question arose: what should we do when LC authorities, CANAUTH, and/or local U of T authority records conflict? The general rule is to use LC whenever possible (i.e. unless they are wrong), because OCLC and other sources of derived records will follow that form. It requires an unrealistic degree of vigilance to keep these LC-established headings out of a catalogue like ours, especially with the amount of "outsourced" batch-loaded records the Central Library now depends on. Even though U of T is not a NACO library, we can still ask LC to consider changing a heading via their authorities website (at http://authorities.loc.gov/), as long as we can demonstrate that they are wrong (e.g. by citing items in hand, AACR2 and LCRIs, etc.). In cases where they will not make the change, and we consider their form egregiously wrong, we can use a CANAUTH heading or create our own, with a note "DO NOT USE LC …". Where we can live with LC's form, we can always add **4XX** cross-references to the LC authority after we import it.

(f) A question about getting unwanted results when limiting Sirsi searches by language has resurfaced. When building indexes and language lists, Sirsi looks first for an **041** field, then for the language bytes in the fixed fields. The problem: field **041** includes subfield **|h** for the code of the original language for items which are or include a translation. So we have records for books which are translations into English in which the **041** field scrupulously includes a code for German, or French, or Finnish, or whatever the original language might have been. This means that if you do a search limiting by a particular language, your results might include items that do not contain that language, simply because what you specified was the language of the original. Sian Meikle asked Sirsi if there was anything they could do about this as long ago as October 2004, but no solution has yet been found. If it were possible to exclude **041** subfield **|h** from this language index then this problem would not arise.

(g) More Hospital libraries are joining Sirsi this fall. Earlier this month nine Health Consortium staff received training on the Cataloguing and Circulation modules in Workflows. The Consortium has an appointed member to CAUG, and is encouraged to subscribe to the CatInfo list. Apropos of training: the question of training for new libraries, and new staff, is an important one for the interim CDC committee to consider (see next Agenda item).

3. Creation of "CDC" subcommittee

The above report shows how frequently questions, problems, policy issues continue to arise concerning the Sirsi database, in conjunction with technical and cataloguing questions. Because of the funding situation, a position for Elizabeth Black's full-time replacement cannot be filled by the Chief Librarian this year, and possibly not next year either. It remains

clear to us that such a position as described at our last meeting by Anne Dondertman (*Fisher*) is urgently needed, but until the money is available, we need some sort of caretaker group to make decisions and issue recommendations to ITS etc., on behalf of CAUG as a whole. The Chief Librarian has encouraged the creation of a subcommittee of CAUG to fill this role.

Over the summer, Alastair proposed that the Membership and Terms of Reference of such a subcommittee be closely modelled on those for the now defunct Advisory Group to the Campus Database Co-ordinator. E.g. its task will be "to implement projects related to union database cleanup and other large-scale improvements (e.g. concatenation … [and] to ensure consistent application of agree upon standards and policies so that the integrity of both bibliographic and authority records is maintained, including reviewing sample records prior to database load of externally created records." We already have some volunteers. From campus libraries: Stephanie Swift (*OISE/UT*), Lorna Young (*Regis*); and from Robarts: Alastair, Maks Okrasa, and Anna Slawek. We will be working closely with a representative from ITS on many issues. Alastair asked any other campus library CAUG members who would agree to part of this subcommittee to contact him by the end of the week. He stressed that this will be a temporary, interim group, that can consult chiefly via e-mail. The point is to get a balance of points of view and expertise from across the campus since there is no single person who combines Elizabeth's knowledge of MARC formats, cataloguing rules, Sirsi configuration, etc. Alastair proposed the subcommittee be given the name Campus Database Committee (CDC). The group approved both the name and the subcommittee. Alastair will send out the official membership list and Terms of Reference on CatInfo next week.

4. Report from Reference Services Committee

(a) Alastair asked at the September 13th Reference Services Committee meeting for data on how catalogue users are searching for series. This will help determine U of T policies for dealing with series authorities, in the aftermath of LC's decision to abandon treating series as a controlled access point. (See next Agenda item). Various Ref Services members felt that problems were certain to arise at least for some series if they were left untraced, but that it would take some time to compile a list of these, since most individual reference librarians typically encountered thorny series questions only a few times a year. Sian Meikle acknowledged that it is theoretically possible to extract information about users' series searches from the log of OPAC activity. It was also suggested that Resource Sharing staff (specifically Jane Lynch) might be well placed to comment on series access difficulties.

Question: Would it be possible to restore the old default for Title searches to include Series as well? (In DRA, the Title index included both **245** and **4XX/830** fields, while the Series index included only the **4XX/830** fields). *Answer:* It is perfectly possible. Elizabeth Black had deliberately kept the two indexes separate when we were setting up Sirsi in the beginning. If there was enough support for the idea, we could ask ITS to change this. Most, but not all, CAUG members favoured the idea. It was suggested that Reference Services should be consulted before making any changes.

(b) There is growing enthusiasm among Reference Services and EIRC for using LC class numbers for e-book call numbers, in order to provide improved subject access for this ever-growing part of our collection. The "New titles" feature of the Sirsi web catalogue demonstrates how such access by discipline can work. The library at North Carolina State University has extended this principle by making "browse by Subject" a central feature of access to their entire catalogue, via the Endeca front end they have added to their OPAC. In both cases, the drop-down lists of subjects are built from the LC classification scheme. We could develop this further. It would make it possible to move from broad to specific subject areas very quickly, without the hit-or-miss results obtained by keyword subject searches.

Alastair showed CAUG an example of how such a class number (without book numbers like cutters and dates) might look in our catalogue. Considerable debate ensued. Some members expressed the fear that users would try to find such items on a shelf, even if the numbers had the suffix **[Online]**, and appeared under the library **Electronic Resources**, with item type **Electronic resource**, and location **Online**.

Item Information	Catalogue Record

Understanding carbon nanotubes [electronic resource] : from basics to applications
Loiseau, A. (Annick)

Springer, c2006.
A Look Inside: · Online

Holdings				Request item >>
Electronic Resources	**Copies**	**Type**	**Location**	
QC176.8.N35 [Online]	1	Electronic resource	Online	

Alastair said that if this proved to be a problem, it might be possible to suppress the LC number in this call number display, although when this idea was proposed at Reference Services, Sian had pointed out this would require an extra processing step when retrieving the data for display. With some members expressing reservations, the group gave the go-ahead for Alastair to ask ITS about the feasibility of automatic creation of LC class numbers based on the subfield **|a** of **050/090** fields in batch-loaded records.

5. **Series headings in LC records: U of T policies**
As of June, the Library of Congress stopped treating series as a controlled access point. In the wider cataloguing community there is a fairly small group (LC administrators, and some senior administrators at other large libraries) who feel that keyword searches combining series titles and publishers' names will be an adequate replacement for controlled access for series. On the other hand OCLC and Library and Archives Canada have announced their intention to continue with series authority work, and there is talk of establishing a NACO "Series Funnel Project" to expand the current provision of series authorities by NACO library members (they already create about half the series authorities in LCAUTH each year).

Therefore, importing OCLC records created or enhanced by NACO members will be just as it was before. Ditto for LC "copycat" records derived from OCLC. So at U of T the problem is, what to do with original LC records, which have previously been regarded as the most desirable. For individual records imported through SmartPORT, Robarts proposes to do the following for any LC original with only a **490** series: *(i).* change the **490** to a **440** and see if it validates; *(ii).* if it does not, but we already have an authority record, so that the traced form can be ascertained using Workflows' validate gadget, create an **830** for the traced form, and change the **440** back to a **490** with first indicator 1; *(iii).* if there is no authority record already in our system, search LCAUTH and CANAUTH via SmartPORT in the usual way, and import a record if available; then follow step *ii* above; *(iv).* if there is no LC / CANAUTH authority available, return the LC bib record to its original condition (**490**), but keep a record of the series name for possible authority creation by a supervisor.

This procedure will not address the several hundred LC records a week batch-loaded for the Central Library as part of the "shelf-ready" material supplied by Coutts. This material will of necessity be left in its original condition as created by LC. (Coutts will not do authority work

at the current price). However, if we can identify certain series for which authority control is essential, we may be able to do periodic clean-up projects.

6. **Other business**

   Over the summer RLG (RLIN) voted to merge with OCLC. The databases are to be combined next year. Anticipating this, the Chief Librarian has asked us reduce RLIN searches where possible. So we should consider it a last-on-the-list source, and prefer SmartPORT "free" databases (e.g. Yale, NYU, Oxford) and OCLC.

   The next meeting will be in November: details to be announced.

The meeting adjourned at 11:33.