MINUTES
JULY 29 1998
MERLIN ACQUISITIONS AND SERIALS COMMITTEE
(MASC)
Attendees: Jean Parker (SLU-PIUS), Chair; Patrick McCarthy (SLU-
PIUS), Rich Rexroat (UMC-HSL), Fay Watkins (UM-ROLLA), Becky Merrell
(UM-ROLLA), Bette Stuart (UMC-ELLIS), Rhonda Glazier (UMC-ELLIS),
Richard Amelung (SLU-LAW), Joyce Edinger (UM-SL), Ellen Grewe (UM-SL),
Janet McKinney (UMKC-LAW), Andy Stewart (UM-ROLLA), Suzy Bent (UMC-
ELLIS), Janet Jackson (LSO), Gary Harris (LSO), Linda Hulbert (SLU-
HSC), Recorder

The meeting was called to order at 10:10.

1. The minutes were approved as distributed.

2. LSO update: Gary Harris presented the response to call C346643a,
which is from Whitney Alexander from III.

4. The memo reports that iii has been able to cause our system to
remember the date, vendor and fund from order record to order record.
It was clear to the members of the committee that Whit has failed to
understand the question.

*Action item: Jean Parker will draft a response outlining the request
to Whit and share it with the committee.

SCAT table. It is the opinion of III that they have improved on the
usefulness of the SCAT tables for our installation.   Apparently there
was a glitch in the system. The usual SCAT table analysis is to cause
the arrangement of the report to be based on the call number in the
bibliographic record. This is how it works for single institution
installations. Because we may have several call numbers in the
bibliographic record, our system is intended to default to the first
item record. It will now do that. However, because each library may
have a different call number, this remains an unuseful analysis. The
president of III expects this to work as they sell this product to
consortium.

*Action item: Linda Hulbert will describe what is the hoped for outcome
with SCAT tables and share with the committee before sending on to III.

Questions: Joyce Edinger asked about the approval load tables. The
following libraries are interested in electronic loads of approval
records: UMKC-Main, UMKC-Law, SLU-HSC, UM-SL, EM-Ellis, UM-Rolla. The
following people are willing to serve on a subcommittee: Janet
McKinney, Rhonda Glazier, Andy Stewart and Brenda.

3. Continuing discussion of adding vendor title numbers (VTN) to
check-in records to permit electronic claiming. Some questions were
answered: EBSCO cannot take advantage of the feature to automatically
add the VTN to the check-in record at the time of electronic invoice
load. SWETS can. We think that BNA can but it will have to be

verified. Questions raised. How does the invoicing program know which check-in record is the appropriate record? Does the VTN change each year?

*Action item: Those libraries interested in having their system do this should discuss these questions with their vendors and post to the list.

5. Electronic journals check-in records.   A long discussion ensued. The question that will be discussed at a meeting on the 18th between MRSC and MQCC is how should the display look for access to electronic resources in MERLIN. Should the 856 field be displayed and if so what should the tag say and where should it be displayed on the record? Other issues include the differences between the web-based version and the text-based version. Also, issues surround the language for those electronic resources that are distantly available and those, which are locally available (CD-ROM). The titles that have caused this discussion are those from Project Muse, Print subscribers and J-Store. How to show method of access? How to show coverage vs. paper holdings? Only the libraries with paper subscriptions will have access to the electronic version. How will we show WHO has access? Should we use a check-in record? Should we use a URL? Should we use only item records? Further, how much work should we put into this project when the electronic subscriptions are only assured through December 1999. Which method would permit the easiest deletion of the information in the event access is not retained. Further, some sites have different methods of access than others do. How do we display the distinction and still allow the users to choose appropriately? In the text based version III displays the active check-in record first (incidentally, active check-in records cost more than inactive check-in records and those cost more than item records). When displaying to the user, the single unscoped item record will be far down the list of items and check-ins. If there is not going to be an 856, then there needs to be a separate bibliographic record for the electronic version (incidentally, Washington University has chosen the two record method of display).

MASC preference to be shared at the meeting on the 18th: 856 should display and be displayed higher on the record in the text-based version; a single check-in record using the unscoped electronic location symbol should be utilized with the identity field indicating those libraries with access and coverage included in the lib has statement.

Who should create these check-in records? Obviously, if only one library holds the title, that library should create the appropriate records. In the case where more than one library holds, Richard has the list and will recommend sharing the pain of creation. Problem: Only the library that creates the check-in record will have access to the record to update OR delete.

6. OCLC local data record updating service. Is any library inputting holdings data in the MARC format? No. The question is moot.

7. Standards: Does this committee currently have any understood

standards? The committee is in concurrence with the existing standards as created by MQCC in consultation with members of this committee. Meanwhile, the committee will continue to monitor the standards as created by other committees and will create those germane to this committee as needed.

9Other: Check-in record creation in the presence of 5 or more item records. MQCC has been having a discussion on this subject. It is appropriate for this committee to weigh in with a recommendation. The original standard stated in the presence of 5 or more items per holding library, a check-in record with a lib has statement was appropriate. The final draft of the standard changed items to volumes. This has created the question as to whether the statement in the 3XX field should prevail when it has bibliographic volumes delineated, or whether the number of item records attached by one institution should prevail. The example raised was a 5 volume set bound in 7 physical pieces. Should a check-in record be created? In the text-based version of MERLIN, the items would be masked by the presence of a check-in record. Richard suggested that the 3XX field should reflect the piece count by saying something like 5 volumes bound in 7. It is the opinion of this committee that because the scoped display will show the user the first 5 items, that if there are more than 5 physical pieces it is appropriate to create a check-in record and notify other holding libraries that a check-in record has been created.
*Action Item: Jean will notify MQCCs chair of the recommendation of this committee.

8. MERLIN structure document. The committee raised the question of representation on the MERLIN committees and would like to suggest to the Directors that each cataloging center have a representative to each committee as official representative and that others may be sent by directors as observers as necessary.

The next meeting will be October 28th and the agenda will include enhancements.

*Action item: Post suggested enhancements to the MASC list.

Gary reported that Version 12 will be installed in the Fall.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Hulbert, Assistant Director for Technical Services
  Saint Louis University Health Sciences Center Library