

MERLIN Coordinators Meeting
MCO Offices, Columbia, MO, October 30, 2002

Chairperson: Ben Lea (UMR)
Minutes: Raleigh Muns (UMSL)

In attendance:

Ben Lea (UMR), Raleigh Muns (UMSL), Janine Gordon (MCO), Brenda Dingley (UMKC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC LAW), Resa Kerns (MU LAW), Karen Darling (MU), Judy Maseles (MU), Win Shih (SLU), Richard Amelung (SLU LAW), Debbie Landi (UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES)

I. Archiving of Coordinators Materials (Debbie Landi, UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES)

Brochures were handed out describing the Archives.

Viewed <http://system.missouri.edu/archives/>
Keyword search of "MOBIUS" will turn up finding aids that exist re: MOBIUS.
Online exhibits were displayed.

Archives are interested in materials from all MERLIN subcommittees, as well as materials from task force and subcommittees which preceded MERLIN. Special interest in all committee minutes.

Archives DO NOT want bills, IDs, or student records with personal information (e.g., SSNs). Such materials CAN be access restricted though.

Coordinators recommended that Archives be given user id and password for access to existing online MCO minutes and materials. Formal request needed to the Directors for this access? The various existing committees should be informed of the Archives search for older records and materials.

II. MERLIN System Sluggishness (Janine Gordon, MCO)

No additional information on why this is happening. There is no consistent pattern or information from analysis that indicates where the problem lies. When contacting III for one incident was told that 5 out of the top 10 processes active were create list processes. Patron loading doesn't appear to be the single causative factor.

MCO is looking into feasibility of just getting changed and new patron records, rather than the entire database being updated as happens now.

Recommend that Coordinators remind library staff on their campuses to not create lists during prime time. Many new employees may not have been informed of this original policy.

Questions for MCO:
Does Millennium take longer than character based?
Does create lists vary CPU use by the type of list being created?

III. MERLIN Placeholders (Judy Maseles, MU)

Reference to the text of circulation notices placeholders. There are lots of placeholders all over the place - do we need all of these?

Placeholders cannot be deleted. They can be renamed (e.g., to something like "Open") in order to indicate that they can be used.

Recommend directing the Circ Committee to deal with this issue by identifying unneeded placeholders, and changing name to "Open".

IV. My Millennium

General discussion. A single universal (fake) patron record could be created for all staff to use. MCO setup is required for ptypes and permissions. Security issues involving ability to change information. Attempted demo showed My Millennium was not functioning. General committee sense was that this sounds like a useful tool, but not currently a compelling issue to devote resources to or pursue.

V. Coordinators Charge Updated (Ben Lea, UMR)

Charge as disseminated has been approved.

VI. Local Data Record (LDR) Updates on Campus Level (Resa Kerns, MU LAW)

This is a MOBIUS Coordinators issue needing input from the clusters (MERLIN). Decision is due Dec. 1. "Free" LDR updates until June 2003; after June 30, 2002 the cost of updating LDR's would be added to the libraries' OCLC bill, just as updating holdings by EBS is now. There would be no cost to MCO but staff time.

We don't know what the cost would be for ongoing basis after June 2003.

OCLC will only handle MARC format. Question is if III output will "bless" records into MARC format. Records to be flagged from "Library Has" statement. Consensus was that if a one time "for free" update of LDR can be done with no expenditure of MCO resources, this would be a good thing. Even without updating after June 2003, the one time results would be positive and useful. However, expenditure of MCO funds higher priority for other projects.

More information is needed including the ability to output MARC format records en masse from III.

Discussed campus by campus opt in with S-codes locally assigned.

VII. Metafind and WebBridge (Resa, MU)

Consensus: Good sounding ideas and products, but no compelling rationale for spending large sums of money on these products. Committee members questioned the need for such products.

VIII. IUG Enhancements

General discussion of enhancements, followed by an informal poll of which enhancements each library favored. Reminder that ballots were due in early November.

Additional items:

Request to see about setting up a listserv solely to cover questions regarding bags and tubs. Possible name would be "bagtub-1". Some members pointed out that they just set up a filter for these messages.