

Revised (12/9/97) Minutes of October 8, 1997

MERLIN QUALITY CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 8, 1997

Members present: Vianne Sha (UMC-Law); Gloria Ho (UMR); Ting James (UMR); Jane Addison (UMC-HSL); Richard Amelung (SLU-Law); Janice J. Carter (SLU-HSL); Robin Kespohl (UMC-Ellis); Nancy Stancel (UMKC-Law); Norma Fair (UMC-Ellis); Anna Sylvester (UMKC); Kathleen Schweitzberger, Committee chair (UMKC); Janet Jackson (LSO); Gary Harris (LSO); Vivian Lee (LSO); David Owens (UMSL); Patrick McCarthy (SLU-Pius); Anna Zaidman (SLU-Pius); Diane Johnson (Guest); Ellen Grewe (UMSL) recorder.

1. Review of minutes of September 10, 1997.

Two corrections: correct spelling for Anna Zaidman's name; BSE in 3.4 should be EBS

2. LSO update:

LSO offices will move to the second floor of the Locust Street Building at 615 Locust Street on November 17, 1997.

Gary:

Kurt Kopp is ready to load the GPO backlog tapes by the end of next week. Kurt found a UMR2 III location. What MERLIN location should be assigned? Gloria said it is a new location for Rolla.

Vivian:

She sent out e-mail messages that Autographics test records had been loaded and wanted us to look at them. The only response came from Robin. The okay was given to Vivian to go ahead and start loading the Autographics records. Kathleen reminded people to watch for duplicate versions of the same series on the same record - something that GPO tends to do. Kurt will first load the GPO backlog tapes (11 tapes of 3,500 records each); Vivian estimated that it would take two weeks to load them. Autographics load can begin next.

Janet:

In order to make the process of pulling records for the EBS load faster, Gary had suggested that we use bibliographical records rather than item records for pulling records for the EBS load. Janet will ask OCLC how much of a bib record do they need. Can OCLC use only the OCLC record number? Vianne would like to be able to use the bib record instead of the item record in order to reduce the number of errors. People often scan in the barcode number in the item record without first asking for a line number, causing parts of the barcode number to end up in various fixed fields in the item record. Vianne would like MQCC to revisit this issue of using the bib instead of item records for the EBS loads. Gary said that he had sent an e-mail to III about these issues, but he has not received any suggestions from III in response.

3. Robin:

In August 1995, Reference librarians said that they wanted to

be able to limit searches by using codes for specific types of material (micro, maps, documents, etc.) They reserved Bcodes 1 and 2 for this purpose. Coordinators will look at this issue at their next meeting, but it will probably need to go back to the Reference people to see if they still want this.

4. Vivian:

Table of Contents statistics are included on the latest printouts from BNA. Robin will post them on the list.

5. Richard:

Last Wednesday, Richard did a presentation for MRSC members on Merlin guidelines for electronic resources based on a draft of the document that he and Vianne have been working on. They have since added a sentence to 3.1 to emphasize that there is no need to recatalog when the only difference is a different format. It was pointed out that care should be taken when assigning subject headings for electronic resources; be certain that a term can legitimately be used as a subdivision or as a form subdivision. If the term is not allowed, a 690 will have to be used instead. The use of a 690 has to be approved by MQCC. It would appear that we cannot use a 655 indicator 7, because that requires a source be identified in subfield 2. (Note: Upon further investigation it was found that we could use a 655 second indicator 7) Kathleen suggested that we keep a list of standardized terms so that all Merlin cataloging centers are using them the same way.

Richard noted that if the 856 field includes a tilde or an underscore it will not export correctly from OCLC. A percent symbol has to be used instead. Richard will add 856 information to the electronic resources document.

After discussion, it was decided that we need to know how MRSC members want electronic resources to be accessed in order for us to decide which fields and terminology we can use. We can tell them the various options. Vianne and Norma will attend their meetings.

The Directors and Reference librarians want one bib location and one item location for Internet resources, because these resources must be available at all MERLIN locations. Vianne suggested that we have 10 item and 10 bib locations. The cataloging center that did the initial cataloging will be responsible for maintaining the URL. Janet will send her list of electronic resources location codes to the list. Richard's document has Call number = Internet; Label = Electronic Resource; Location = Remote Access.

6. Diane Johnson (MRSC member)

She gave a brief overview and demo of the MERLIN OBJECTS project. She and Raleigh Muns have been developing a database of databases in order to help patrons distinguish and select databases. Right now each database comes up on its own HTML page. Hot links are imbedded and display in blue. They would like to end up with a database of resources under different topics such as law and music, and develop the capability of indicating what type of user (undergraduate for instance) a particular database is geared to.

Vianne mentioned the following concerns about the concept and the application of these objects.

1. Will these MERLIN objects databases be campus-wide or merely a library project?
2. If it is a library project, it is up to the library to decide what and how these should be included in its system or Web site.
3. If it is a campus-wide project (which means these MERLIN objects will be placed on the MERLIN Gateway or somewhere in the catalog), who will be responsible for selecting, designing, and maintaining the database? If every library creates its own database and puts it in the MERLIN system, these databases will not be integrated and will therefore have less value in terms of searching.
4. These MERLIN objects databases sound like annotated bibliographical guides which I think have their value. But the mainstream will still be the library catalog because of the number of records and material types involved, and the system vendors' commitment to improve the system to meet future technological needs.
5. Therefore, I believe we should catalog these electronic databases into the library catalog as a final means of offering a fully integrated catalog to public users. MARC format has its shortcomings, like any other kind of standard, but it is also has many good features that have not been used by libraries or library systems. It took many years to develop a standard/model and to create billions of records for use in the library. It is better to make use of it than to create another standard/model for use and for sharing.

Robin asked if a user could get to the MERLIN OBJECTS from the library catalog and from the WEB. Answer - not yet. It resides only on Raleigh's machine.

Richard suggested that the phrase "Restricted to Merlin users only" be changed to "Available to Merlin users."

7. Guicat demo and discussion.

Because of the number of problems and limitations, Robin wondered if Guicat is not actually fully developed and users are serving as beta testers. Sean Pickett at III is the person who is handling the Guicat project. People reported a number of problems. Some were still problems, while others seem to have been resolved. Jane described a situation that she found when she added medical subject headings to records while using Guicat. Upon investigation, it was discovered that everything she added in Guicat became added keywords.

Action item:

Robin and Kathleen will write up what errors still seem to be errors. They will send the list to LSO, and LSO will forward it on to Sean.

In discussing the issue of training for Guicat, the Committee decided that if we have already paid for training from III, then we should accept that. If we have not paid, we would rather set up our own training session. The Coordinators meet next week, and George can tell them if we have paid for training. If we do our own training, Vianne offered the use of the law school's training room. There are 12 workstations and a large monitor. Guicat will be the agenda for the MQCC December 10th meeting. Vianne will

check and see if this date is okay. In the meantime, people need to use and become somewhat familiar with Guicat, and to keep sending in problems and questions.

8. 655 subfield 2

MRSC went along with our suggestion to suppress subfield 2.

9. Blind references

In response to Anna Sylvester's question about keeping reciprocal headings when they do not lead to anything, the consensus was that we should delete an authority record if it does not lead to any bib records. If you suppress it with the see references still attached, Robin noted that staff can still see the references and that can be confusing. It is best to remove the cross-references before suppressing and coding for BNA to delete.

The Blind References Cataloging Standard was accepted as revised.

10. Robin

Do we have to maintain the create date in an authority record? In Guicat we need to be able to set a default date in the template. Decision - we will keep the standard but say that it does not have to be the current date because of Guicat template limitations.

11. New codes

Jane requested a new item status code for the Health Information Center at the Columbia Mall. Materials there are checked out manually. The status code will alert them that they have to call the given telephone number. The new code will be h.

Patrick had asked for a status code of b to mean "at the bindery."

Next meeting: November 12, 1997