MERLIN Quality Control Committee
Minutes -- Feb. 11, 1998

Present: Allison Holdway (UMR); Anna Zaidman (SLU-Pius); Jane Addison
(UMC-HSL); Norma Fair (UMC); Robin Kespohl (UMC); Alice Allen (UMC); Janet
Jackson (LSO); Richard Amelung (SLU-Law); Kathleen Schweitzberger (UMKC);
Gary Harris (LSO); Janice Carter (SLU-HSL); Vianne Sha (UMC-Law); Nancy
Stancel (UMKC-Law); Vivian Lee (LSO); Ellen Grewe (UMSL); David Owens
(UMSL); Ting James (UMR), recorder.

1.Announcements, introductions, etc.:

    Each attendent introduced him/herself to Chris Mottayaw, a
representive from OCLC Authority Control Service.

2.Minutes from the meeting of 12/10/97:

    The minutes were accepted with correction. The correction: under
4d. 4, should read "As of now, 970's will not load. Wash. U. is currently
using BNA, but BNA will not allow us to display TOC in INNReach."

3.OCLC authority control:

    Chris Mottayaw made a presentation about OCLC's Authority Control
Service. She reviewed some background of the service. The OCLC's Authority
control Service started with world cat. database which has 38 million
records and Harvard authority control project. The authority control
staff are all experienced. Language expertise is available. Chris also
offered some information on OCLC's purchasing BNA's authority file. BNA
sold the authority service in order to concerntrate on their book selling
service. Chris pointed out some differnces between OCLC's and BNA's
authority control. (e.g. different software, different workflow, different
charge, different look on printing outs of the headings reports, etc.) The
goals for OCLC's continuing authority control include: to reduce manual
review, to be cost effective, MeSH heading speed up, turn around time
(daily?) etc. OCLC is in the process of testing MU-SLU's authority file.
There are a lot of communications between OCLC and BNA at this time. Robin
asked if OCLC can atttach auth. holdings while downlocading the record
like bib. records do. The answer is OCLC will look into it and can be a
future project for OCLC. Can OCLC maintain our local history file? The
answer is "Yes". There is a doubt about the previous thought on having
the file sent to OCLC for authority service, then OCLC will send the file
to BNA for TOC service. BNA then will send the file back to us. The worry
is that the file might get corrupted by using different softwares.
However, OCLC will still look into this option.

4.   LSO updates:

    1. Scoping table: Location codes had been removed from all Law
Library socpes. The problem has been corrected. The electronic codes can
be used now. SLU-Pius new code is also in effect.

    2. New location codes: wait for Janet's approval to use.

3. Merlin is slow on all campuses. Janet is going to find out why.

4. Janet has sent Robin's request for spine labels to III.

5. GuiCat items transfer is working ok now. The call for this problem will be closed at this time. It can reopen if the problem resurfaces.

6. The URL checker from U. of Calif. at San Diego is not what we thought. Gary is looking into this issue.

7. Z39.50 for W.U.: W.U. has the software available and hopefully it will be connected soon. Gary reminds everybody to use the new numbering system for the standards so he can put it on the LSO's web. Gary is also working on the table of the contents for the standards.

8. AG records can be used now. Please resolve the dups. if you see any. Standards for editing AG records will be under appendix E. Robin will work on it.

9. Vivian reported that another AG tape has been loaded successfully. Three more tapes to go,(each contains 40,000 records.) It is expected to finish loading by Mar. 1998.

10. AG headings report: no headings reports are being retained for AG records.

5.   Enhancement requests:

There is no request at this time. Vianne asked about the possibility to have the system purchase cataloger's desk top. Robin suggested to put the request through the coordinaors group.

Kathleen inquired about the ability to have III increase the Merlin headings match from 72 characters to 125 characters.

6.   Training days proposal from coordinators:

We still have three days paid for III training. The three possibilities are: training for statistics, training for advanced reserve function, training for Acq./Ser. model. No decision has been made.

Each campus will think about how we are going to do ongoing inhouse training and report by April 1st. Ongoing training for new staff requires a lot of work such as preparation, setting up, etc. LSO has nobody working on this area.

7.   Update on INNReach:

The INNReach Task Force group met on Feb. 6th at W.U. comparing the two profiles. Not many problems found. The biggest difference is in |n (subfield n) conference headings.

8.   Draft of Append. C

    Robin will revise it.

Ting James
Saint Louis University
Law Library-Tech. Services
3700 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63108
314-977-2798
jamests@slu.edu