MINUTES OF THE MASCC MEETING, APRIL 29, 1998

Attendees: Brenda Dingley (UMKC), Robert Cleary (UMKC), Andy Stewart
(UMR), Rich Rexroat (UMC-HSL), Joyce Edinger (UMSL), Ellen Grewe (UMSL),
Jean Parker (SLU-Pius), Patrick McCarthy (SLU-Pius), L. Hunter Kevil
(MU-Ellis), Richard Amelung (SLU-Law), Linda Hulbert (SLU-HSC), Janet
Jackson (LSO), Bette Stuart (MU-Ellis), Suzy Bent (MU-Ellis), Rhonda
Glazier (MU-Ellis).

1. Review of the minutes/Assignment of recorder:

Minutes were assigned to SLU-Pius for this meeting.
There were no additions or corrections to the minutes of October 29, 1997.

2. Election of the new Chair

Jean Parker (SLU-Pius) was selected as the chair for the coming year.
Brenda graciously agreed to chair the current meeting.

3. Announcements:

1. Patrick Bickers is the new Monographic Acquisitions Librarian at UMKC.

2. SLU-Pius will be generating a lot of changes regarding
existing check-in records as a result of their project to create new check-ins
(SLU had no holdings statements created as a result of the original
tapeload). They were asked to batch changes in check-in records to the
various libraries and send them to the contact people listed on the LSO
webpage.

4. LSO Update

1. The installation of the RAID cabinet on May 18 was announced.

2. The Inn-reach test file is available on MIRACL. Currently
members are examining the records. Circulation profiles are due on May 1,
with a target date of having the entire database up and ready for use in the
fall. There was discussion about the use of various codes, particularly
SCODEs 2 and 3, and the different ways they are used by the libraries.
In particular, in INNREACH, SCODE 2=n is the suppression code. MU-Ellis
has been using it for other things, so we need to find out about the
suppression issue.

5. Adding vendor IDs to check-ins

There was a general discussion of the III enhancement in which
unique vendor IDs can be located in the order record. Several questions were
raised:

a. How does the software recognize that a particular library

has both a check-in and an order?

b. How will the software know WHICH check-in record a
particular order "goes with?"

c. What are the plans for the major vendors for processing
electronic claims and invoices?

Individuals volunteered to query their individual vendors and III (at
IUG?) by the next meeting.

6. Sharing Default Records

Linda Hulbert described the process for creating order records
by using update mode, and attaching order records. Currently, we are
not able to "save" the information (such as department, vendor, etc.)
from the previous order record. Linda would like to make the
system "remember"the information from one order record to the next.
As the group was generally in favor of this, Linda will ask III if
this can be done, and if the change would affect other things
that would cause a problem.

7. Elements of check-in records and standard usage

The issue of whether there are (or should be) standard phrases for
information contained in various fields in check-in records was
discussed. There was general discussion about how different libraries
are handling IDENTITY, NOTE1, and Library Has fields. Generally, the
group was not in favor of standardized phrases, but agreed that sharing
information would be valuable. It was agreed that people that had
guidelines or procedures for the phrasing would post them to the list.

8. Order record creation

There was a general discussion of the procedures for creating order
records. Generally people do NOT suppress order records, and ARE
exporting bibliographic records to which to attach orders (if you are
exporting without the order record attached, you need to remove the
CATDATE from the bibliographic record or it could be sent to BNA before
the material arrives).
anet mentioned at this point that the "create lists" function
is running very slowly. LSO is aware of it, but if we need to create lists
against the entire database, we should wait until this function is
working better if possible.

9. Proposed enhancements

There was a very general discussion of enhancement requests
including the following items:

a. Create Lists needs to be a more complete report-writer

b. It would be nice to be able to prioritize question/problems for the

help desk (Janet pointed out that the more complete information
including screen printsthat we can provide on problems the better
able LSO is to get answers).

c. Scat tables should work in a shared environment

d. Duplicate barcodes should be disallowed

e. "Holds" should show in item records

f. Both alpha and numeric characters should be allowed for check-in and
prediction

   ****Other enhancement requests should be sent to the list.****

10. Other: It was suggested that a session for dealing with "check-in
solutions" (such as the acquisitions year-end or the binding session)
would be a helpful topic for an upcoming meeting.

11. Next meetings: The next meetings were scheduled for July 29 and
October 28 in Columbia.

12. Summary of "Action Items"

1. Individual libraries should query their serials vendors
regarding anticipated use of electronic invoicing and claiming, and plans for
using the unique vendor identification number.

2. III needs to be asked about how the unique vendor
identification number enhancement actually works.

3. Linda Hulbert will ask III if "remembering" can be turned on
in the Update Orders portion of order creation, and what impact it might have
in a consortial environment.

4. Libraries that have guidelines for phrasing in IDENTITY,
LIBRARY HAS, and NOTE 1 fields will post them to the list.

5. People with ideas for additional enhancements will post them
to thelist.

6. Is anyone willing to prepare/lead a discussion on "check-in
solutions" for the next meeting?)

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Parker
Patrick McCarthy

Saint Louis University, Pius Library