

Minutes of the Cataloguing and Authorities Users' Group
13 September 2011, 10:00 a.m., Robarts Rm 4049

Present: Mary Jaques (St. Michael's College), James Mason (Music), Janina Mueller (Map and Data Library), Lisa Andrews-Attwater (Rotman), Monica Hypher (center for Ind. Rels and HR), P.J. MacDougall (Massey), Stephaine Swift (OISE), Carmen Socknat (Vic), H. Rashid (Law), Carmen Garcia (Mt. Sinai), Irene Wu (ROM), Anna Golodmitsky (Knox), Helen Ge (Knox), Stephen Qiao (East Asian), Mary Ruscillo (Robarts), Juliya Borie (Robarts), Sherry Smugler (Gov Pubs / Reference), Wendy Li (Hong Kong), Diana Liang (UT Scarborough Library), Mary Reynolds (Regis), Lana Soglasnova (Robarts), Elisa Sze (iSchool Inforum), Kate MacDonald (Trinity), Marlene (Robarts), Alastair (Robarts).

1. Approval of the minutes:

James Mason brought forward motion to approve minutes from the last meeting; Humayun Rashid seconded; group approved.

2. Business arising: None

Marlene mentioned that she did not get time to look into whether UTL submits records to Amicus, a topic that had come up at the last meeting.

3. Report from the Metadata Librarian

a. Serials Solutions migration e-resource management

Marlene reported that the process of getting data from EIR into the Serial Solutions ERM began in January. The main challenge was to get data out of Serials Solutions-ERM and into the catalogue. Marlene spoke to other libraries and determined they used *360 MARC Updates* a companion product that gathers LC MARC records and provides the library with monthly content updates to merge with holdings in our system.

Marlene described the process by which Serials Solutions-ERM updates our e-content records (see accompanying ppt presentation document for more detail). She worked closely with Serials Solutions to provide specifications customized for UTL. From these specifications, Serials Solutions sets up a profile and files are sent monthly or bi-weekly to update our records.

Question: are we getting a match according to what Serials Solutions-ERM has in its database, not necessarily everything that we have?

Marlene explained that the implementation team has systematically matched what Serials Solutions has against our e-resource content holdings.

Question: will this process ultimately save time or is it just to improve findability? Marlene indicated

it was both. Although the migration is time consuming, the management of e-resources will ultimately become more effective.

Benefits: Marlene provided a list of advantages to using Serials solutions: better findability of e-resources, more MARC records to provide title-level access rather than just collection level; concatenation of e-resources with clearer coverage and content provider information; direct linking to resources; full MARC records for e-resources that would include subject headings; better support for virtual shelf-browsing; greater ability to maximize Summon and Endecca's faceting capability;

Question: Will everything go into Serial Solutions? Marlene: EIR will remain for certain materials that would not be appropriate within the Serials Solutions-ERM.

Timeline: Marlene indicated the following timeline for getting electronic content into Serials Solutions: E-journal content by next week; e-books over the next three weeks (more challenging due to the prior practice of merging print and electronic bib recs)

Question: For direct purchases from Coutts, will it still be necessary to edit records and submit them to EIR? Marlene said yes that Serials Solutions is mainly to deal with titles brought in packages.

Question: Can you give more detail about Serial Solutions in general? Marlene said they were part of Proquest and she was uncertain when they were contracted by U of T as the relation predates her current position.

b. *Recognizing Serials Solutions records*

360 MARC Updates records should not be edited by anyone because they are updated monthly. **The 035 matchpoint must not be changed.**

Serials Solutions ID numbers start with ssj, full MARC records, or ssib, similar to mini-bibs.

Examples: (WaSeSS)ssj0001760 or (WaSeSS)ssib005436812

Currently these records are only viewable in TORT. See accompanying example for the Bulletin of environmental contamination...

Question: For course readings with simple links, will these still be valid. M: working on that to redirect search to EIR to the new record.

Question: what if the simplelinks are not in EIR? M: Hopefully there won't be many of those, but Sian Meikle would be the person to ask.

Question: For libraries outside of central who buy e-resources, do we still submit the link via the EIR

web form? Further clarification on this process is needed as it won't be that way in the future.

Question: Elisa Sze mentioned that she had been working with a specific article in the Taylor and Francis database and then one day was gone. What happened to it? Marlene was not sure, and she asked Elisa to forward her the details; she also asked them same of the group if they noticed similar examples.

c. Authority Control:

Marlene reported that a significant number of records (over a million) had never gone through the authority control validation process. They had valid headings but were not connected to the authority control module, which means headings cannot be updated automatically. These have been updated.

d. Sirsi Bug - authority flipping

When Sirsi was upgraded to 3.4 a bug has developed preventing the creation of a 961 Authority tag when an authority record is updated, for example when a death date is added to an author's name by downloading an authority record and overlaying it with ours.

Typically when an authority control record is upgraded, the old item is put in the 961 field, and a process is run overnight to update all records in the database. Since the 961 tag is not being created, the records with the old authority control information are not updated while new records will have the subject headings with new authority information resulting in a split hitlist.

There was some discussion about the limitations of subject heading validation in Sirsi--validation only to subfield A and not free-floating subdivisions that could follow. With Sirsi it is all or nothing when it comes to flagging these types of subject. Alastair stressed that people should be vigilant about looking in the authority file to see if a subdivision is applicable.\

4. Report from Alastair Boyd

a. E-resources with access restrictions

Sian Mickle has asked that libraries with private subscriptions to certain databases ensure that they make clear in the 856 field that access is restricted to a particular user group and not all U of T users. Currently there seems to be no way to order the links in the OPAC so a link to a subscription only available to Mount Sinai Hospital Staff could be nearer the top than one for a general subscription.

b. *Firm Orders Directly from Coutts:*

This only affects libraries who place firm orders using Coutts Oasis. During the ordering process, instead of linking an acquisitions record to bib record in the catalogue, the item is ordered within the Coutts Oasis system and a record is loaded into our system overnight.

Preventing duplicates has been a challenge. The records in Oasis have no LCCN, only an ISBN, so instead of matching on title control key the match has to be by ISBN. Because our database is filled with vendor records, the Oasis records are finding matches with these records and attaching orders to them instead of the proper ones, so they have to be manually changed.

Alastair proposed two solutions: 1) Change the preferred title control key source from LCCN to ISBN. The main disadvantage of this option is that ISBN has not been used consistently. In some countries the same ISBN has been used for all titles published in the same year.

2) Request that the vendor records be taken out of the database, which would be the easiest solution, though it may be met with some resistance from collections development.

c. *Knox Recon Project*

A vendor contracted to assist with a recon project auto-generated a number of barcodes without understanding how barcodes are managed within the UTL system. 1000 did not load because they matched existing barcodes but a large number were loaded that could potentially match new unused barcodes. These will be removed shortly but in the meantime if you try linking a new barcode that is flagged as being in use, this could be why.