MQCC MINUTES -- AUGUST 13, 1997

Present: Kathleen Schweitzberger (UMKC), Anna Sylvester (UMKC), Nancy
Stancel (UMKC-Law, recorder), Richard Amelung (SLU-Law), Linda Hulbert
(SLU-HSC), Robin Kespohl (UMC), Anna Zaidman (SLU-Pius), Jane Addison
(UMC-HSL), Gloria Ho (UMR), Ting James (UMR), Ellen Grewe (UMSL),
David Owens (UMSL), Vivian Lee (LSO), Patrick McCarthy (SLU-Pius),
Randy Diamond (UMC-Law), Vianna Sha (UMC-Law).

1. INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS: Vianne Sha (UMC-Law) introduced
the new UMC Law Library Associate Director, Randy Diamond.

2. CORRECTION TO THE MINUTES: July 16, 1997

   Present list: Correction to the spelling of Anna's (SLU-Pius) last
   name toZaidman

   X. Other: Bullet three should read: UMC-Law not UMKC-Law.

3. LSO UPDATE:

Gary Harris:
   3.a. GPO Loads from LUMIN: The "Rearrange and update" program did
not change 8 of 59 test government document records to a location
code of "multi" in the bibliographic record. Two examples of this
error can be found in records .b34369028 (SLU-Law) and .b18475267.
What is odd is that the summary has all of the multiple holdings
present at the end of each bibliographic record. In addition, the
multi feature displays correctly in public mode as long as the
terminal is not scoped.   The test records performed this way
regardless of whether the record was new to III, or was an existing
record in the database.   Fifty-one of the records were new to III.
Gary looked at the remaining 51 test records, and some of them have
been updated correctly.   Another odd characteristic of the load was
discovered by Richard A. The Bcode which was originally coded as
blank, changed to "n" (suppressed).   You would not see this unless
you were in staff mode searching an exact title. All of the GPO LUMIN
records came in with a Bcode of blank, but this code needs to
default to a hyphen. Gary can correct the load program so that the
Bcode goes in correctly. Gary will also change the default template
so that Bib Lvl and Mat Type fields that were also changed to blanks,
will be correctly changed to hyphens.

The question was asked as to whether we can we create a single
bibliographic record and attach several locations, and then test it?
We could then see if the LOC changes to multi on that record instead
of running a test through a whole file. Vivian left to do this during
the meeting, but because of scheduling, could not do the update
portion at that time. In this test record .b34234172 the multi
location was correctly added.

Vivian mentioned that the "Update and Rearrange" program has recently
had a complete run through the entire database.

It was noticed that the Enc Lvl of "blank" (part of the 008 field) is present in all LUMIN government document records loaded from LUMIN, whether that field was coded as a "K" , " I", or "blank". Janet J. thought that perhaps we aren't mapping the load tables correctly. Upon inspection of the load table, the 008 was coded N/A and that is why it did not map correctly. This field is encoded correctly in other LUMIN records that aren't GPO.

Richard A. also wondered why the 007 field always appears with no data in it in all of the test records. (see .o30758060 for an example).   He believes that because it is a microform record, the III system is expecting it to have an 007 so it added the field regardless that the OCLC or LUMIN did not have the field.   Field 007 is not in LUMIN's pre-processor, but MERLIN expects to see it on certain records.   A map format record also displayed the blank 007 field. Richard asked if we feel that we need to be concerned about it? We could use this field (007) in the future for limiting a search.   The group decided that if a campus wants to put it in, it is fine to do so.   It should not be made mandatory, otherwise, we have thousands of records with blank 007's that would need to be handled manually. This is because the III system is unable to do a rapid update on a fixed field element.   Should LSO do create list and delete this field?   This can be considered for a future project.

Robin suggested that after the government document load, we could create a review to find out how many records have blank 007's, and determine whether we want to remove the blank 007 fields out of the records. Gary said that he can do this.   Since all LUMIN government document records have a cataloged date of 12/24/92, it should be easy to mark those records with that condition to create a review file.

Kathleen S: Kathleen wanted to know if it was possible to setup the 945's subfield "s" as a default of " o" on UMKC government document records. Gary said "no", not currently, but it could be done in the future.   Kathleen needs the beginning and ending number of records run so that she can run it and change status to non-circulating. Gary will create a review file that we can use to pull records.

   3.b. LSO has floppies for the Cataloger's Work Station and they've successfully installed it on the system. Janet J. said that she had originally been sent a bad disk. Then it was noticed that the setup information is not correct in the software. Janet will need to get the correct settings from III. This will be available soon and she will ask if there is any documentation in this area. Training on the work station is an extra purchase. There is no limit on how many attend, but a charge is logged during each session. This would probably require only one day of training, but we may not need it. Janet mentioned that the menu bar question mark checks for corrections on the software, and will update it automatically. Janet said that it did install correctly and was easy to do.   This program will reside in a directory on sequoia, and we will be able to download to a subdirectory, then upload it onto individual computers.

3c. George not here today. He was suppose to give MQCC an
electronic report for us but it hasn't been as of yet. Kathleen S.
was under the impression that Janet J. was working on the misattached
item report. We will need to wait for George to get back and comment
on this. Kurt Kopp had no knowledge of where George was on this
project.

3d. 010 Load: It is completed. The last load was run for records
dependent on the 035 `s as matching points. The GPO load matches on
the 001 (not the 010) so it does not need to retain the 035's.   No
one should have to transfer 035's any longer.   However, some
locations currently use the 035's for other purposes, so we should not
remove them.

Temp 945's: These can be deleted because we are not maintaining them.
 Some campuses are leaving them in. Kurt K. was asked if the plan was
to take them out eventually? He saw no reason why they couldn't be
removed.   BNA has moved some notes into SLU's 945's (multiple
fields), so, we need to leave these in for now.

Kurt K. is just beginning work on the GPO pre-processor. He needs
final information as to which fields should be included. It will take
him a couple of weeks to complete this task. Kurt verified with MQCC
that it wants multiple GPO records to include all holdings and that
the pre-processor program should delete duplicate bibliographic
records.

3e. OCLC EBS load: Janet J. has all of the review files pulled.
She will not delete these test files that produced incorrect results
in case we still have problems with the extraction.   The number of
records pulled is as follows: UMC - 6,387, UMC-HSL/VET - 824 (660,
and 166 respectively), UMC-Law - 3, UMKC - 698, UMK-Law -203, Rolla
- 1,990, UMSL - 277, SLU-Pius - 0, SLU-HSL - 0, SLU-Law - 255.
She is using the SLU-Law file for a test run. There is no schedule
set up yet to indicate how and when she will to pull records for the
OCLC EBS loads. Janet has a six step procedure to review first
before she can set a schedule. This is a labor intensive process
because LSO has to attach headers to each file and send each one
individually. Once the routine is in place, Vivian L. should be able
to handle these quickly.   Janet pulled the bibliographic records on
7/5/97 . She has not yet determined how she can pull the items from a
bibliographic review file and this is a real barrier to the process of
extracting records.   It is not possible to pull by an item file
(which has bibliographic records attached) because LSO has to export a
bibliographic file, not an item file. Kathleen S. asked Janet to
check with III or OCLC to find out who else is doing this so that we
can find out how they export bibliographic records. MLNC may be able
to help as well. It was thought that the OhioLink libraries could
shed some light on this process.   Kathleen will post a message to the
listserv. Gary mentioned that he saw a listserv message recently that
stated that III has added a menu option on how to do this type of
export.

3.f. DUPLICATE CHECK:

3.f.1. Interactive download: Janet J. wanted III to do an
"Insert, Insert, Insert" option for downloading. She was told that
this is not an option. III has "Overlay, Insert, Overlay". MQCC
members wanted to know if III would make the first option possible.
III is checking to see if we can be notified that there's a duplicate
record without losing either record. Otherwise, LSO may have to have
a separate load table for this process. It was noted that the OCLC
batch process cannot be made unavailable to campuses as long as the
state historical and archives locations need this feature.
   3.f.2. Autographics Tape Load: Janet J. said that we can do an
"Insert, Reject, Reject". MQCC supported this process. George R.
disagrees with this process and wants to discuss it further.
Drawbacks include that it takes longer to do a load when checking for
duplicates, and that it could be a problem to tie up one machine for a
long time. On the flip side, it is costly in time and money to
resolve the duplicates that we know will be in this load. MQCC will
express its desire not to have duplicate records load and ask George
why he objects to this. MQCC can discuss this electronically with
George when he gets back.

4. OLD LUMIN RECON CODE "r"

   It was discovered that UMC's "r" recon code did not transfer over
from LUMIN records into III. However, Kathleen S. discovered the "r"
was back when she went to change and Enc Lvl to I , in the 008 field
and "r" was in it. UMC's LUMIN "anr and asr" recon records (that were
purchased) were coded with the "r" as a means of identifying them as
recon.   What happened was that MQCC decided to have the "r" Bcode2
removed because it wasn't being used. After we deleted it, III had
all of the "r's" put into the Enc Lvl field instead! We may want to
change it at some point.

5. MERLIN CHECK-IN NOTE ENHANCEMENT REQUEST:

   Campuses used LUMIN general, internal, and reference notes to
delineate types of information and where it displayed in a record.
When these notes were mapped to III, we had asked that the internal
notes go into internal note field in MERLIN. This did not happen so
these notes display to the public. For example, of the 29,000 in UMC
records, 15,000 carry the internal note of "union listed", which is
meaningless to the public.
   The MASCC group suggested creating a new public note. MQCC felt
that with future developments in III, if we create a unique note
field, and III does something different with the first note that
displays, this could create more problems for us.
   UMSL, UMKC, and UMSL-Pius feels the current note display situation
is a real problem for them because the notes that show are outdated or
misleading. It was mentioned that in the full screen editor, you can
change a tag to a different tag altogether. If you create a review
file, update, then choose, "review file", you can change each record
and "next" your way through the list. For example, you could change a
general note to an Identity field. Because the first note displays,
and you can repeat it and the remaining notes will become internal

notes because of their position in the record. If you insert a note,
it has to be manually moved to the correct location. MASCC felt that
internal notes should display ONLY as internal notes and MQCC agreed
with that position. We could turn on the "z" note field so it
displays in checkin mode instead of public display. By far, those who
don't want them to display are in the minority. MQCC amends its
recommendation to the ILS Coordinators to match MASCC'S desire that
internal notes display ONLY as internal notes, but not create a new
note field. MQCC members will need time before turning on the notes
option so that records can be cleaned up ahead of time.

6. MERLIN STANDARDS: Robin K. suggested that we change "MERLIN
Standards" to "MERLIN Standards & Guidelines" (there were no
objections). The following three revised standards received
preliminary approval and willl be reviewed again by MQCC prior to
being posted to the web.

   6.a. NLM Subjects (Hulbert)
   _____
4.5.2 STANDARDS FOR NLM SUBJECTS
   These standards apply to tags: 650 bx, 651 bx, 690 bx, 691 b2
(b=blank)

4.5.2.1. The NLM subject authority is the latest edition of MeSH.

4.5.2.2. NLM assigned subjects will not be changed or deleted. They
may be upgraded to conform with current subject heading practices.

4.5.2.3. Additional subjects may be added in accordance with the
authority.

4.5.2.4. Obvious typographical errors on MERLIN can be corrected
without notifying the cataloging centers.

4.5.2.5. Subject headings found not to be in conformance with MeSH
can be corrected without notifying the originating cataloging center -
an example might be a subdivision incorrectly stated.

4.5.2.6. Disagreements over use of a subject heading relating to the
intellectual analysis of the material will be resolved through
consultation with the originating cataloging center.

   6.b NLM Subject Authority File (Addison):
   _____
5.3.2 STANDARDS FOR NLM SUBJECT AUTHORITY FILE <link to 4.5.2>

5.3.2.1. The NLM subject authority is the latest editioin of MeSH.
Until it is available, the authority is the printed current edition of
Medical Subject Headings-Annotated alphabetic list (MeSH).

5.3.2.2. Standards for names as subjects are the Standards for Name
Authority Records and the Standards for Form of Entry (5.1).

5.3.2.3. MeSH and cross-references must have ending punctuation.

5.3.2.4. Standards for NLM subject authority file usage are in the preliminary pages of each annual printed MeSH, entitled "Cataloging practices."

5.3.2.5. Acode MeSH codes <link>
Acodes will presented here in a list.

   6.c. Collection Level Records (Grewe)
_____

9.2 COLLECTION LEVEL CATALOGING IN MERLIN

9.2.1. Introduction
Collection level cataloging records describe a made-up multipart group of items that were not originally published, distributed, or produced together, but have been gathered together because of some other unifying factor. Collection level records are intended to be input directly into MERLIN by authorized library staff mainly for ease of circulation. Examples of possible collections: Vertical file, Keys for study rooms, Test collection, AV equipment, Artwork, etc.

9.2.2. Description

9.2.2.1. Input records in MARC format.

9.2.2.2. Follow Revised AACR2, Chapter 10, for description of the collection.

9.2.2.3. Indicate in the title field the location of the collection for generic titles. (Examples of titles: Test collections at theThomas Jefferson Library; Pamphlet file at the UM-St. Louis Health Sciences Library).

9.2.2.4. Encoding Level may be coded "K" for minial level cataloging.

9.2.2.5. Bibliographic Level must be coded "c" for collection.

9.2.3. Subject Treatment

9.2.3.1. Apply authorized subject headings for collections that need subject treatment for public access.

9.2.4. Suppressing Records

9.2.4.1. Suppress records for collections that have no need for public viewing (Examples: Keys for study rooms, AV equipment, etc.)

9.2.5. Item Records

9.2.5.1. Enter I-Type, Location, and Barcode.

9.2.5.2. Enter call number in the correct call number file (050 for
LC, 090 for Other, etc.).

===
   6.d.-g. not discussed due to time limitations.

7. CREATING LISTS USING REVIEW FILES: In the past III has been able
to add fields to records so that they can be more easily searched and
linked. For instance, "course reserves" was added to link item
records to course reserves so that they are searchable that way. It
allows you to create a report that lists all bibliographic titles that
are linked to course reserves. We may want to pursue an enhancement
to create item review files that can link items records to
bibliographic records.

 8. BNA LOADS AND EXTRACTIONS: We're creating authority records that
 BNA can't use so they had to manually change many records in the last
 project.

   8.a. MQCC had set up Bcodes that determine which authority records
are sent to BNA. Janet J. then pulled records and sent them to BNA.
BNA was expecting different files with different records for purposes
of matching on different fields. What BNA needs are Local Names
(Add), Local Names (Del), OCLC Names (Add), OCLC Name (Del), Subjects
(Adds), Subjects (Del), LC Names (Add), LC Names (Del), MESH (Del).
We don't want MESH Adds because there is no update service for MESH.
This information was distributed in a memo from III dated 8/1/97.
MQCC needs to figure out how to give BNA what it needs.

After discussing several possibilities, MQCC felt that the easiest way
to deal with this situation was to create new Acode 2's. This will
be confusing because people are not correctly coding that field right
now.   But, if we don't handle it this way, there will be too many
parameters needed for Janet J. to pull the records. We need to
continue to send Local Names to BNA, otherwise, local names get
"flipped" to other names, especially for authors that have written
theses. MQCC had Janet J. add the following Acodes to the table
during the meeting:

BCODE2: New values for local headings.
Local Names (Add):   n
Local Names (Del):   n & Asuppress=d
Local Subjs (Add):   s
Local Subjs.(Del):   s & Asuppress=d
LC Names, (Add):   a
LC Names, (Del):   a & Asuppress=d
LC Subjs. (Add):   d
LC Subjs. (Del):   d & Asuppress=d
MESH del: m & Asuppress=d

Robin K. will clean these up (she will change the Bcode " b" to the
correct setting). She and Gary will get this information on the Web.
You can't take any code out once the record has been used.

Richard A. distributed a handout which showed the problem of records coming back from BNA, but there is no way to tell in MERLIN whether its for a Name or Name used as a Subject. Discussion centered around whether there is a way for records coming back from BNA to be coded for us as Acode=d (LC Names used as a Subject). Richard suggested that the process could be "reversed" in that everything that comes in on the Name File that is coded with a hyphen, we would know that it is a Subject. Richard will write a proposal for this.

DON'T USE ACODE2=B anymore. Use the newly created codes above.

   8.b. Extraction of projects: how many projects should be at BNA at one time? Kathleen S. was concerned about the two to three month turn around time for one project, which means a four to six month delay on authority records that you can't go in and correct. Robin said that this is a contractual issue. If we drop manual review, then this should not be an issue any longer. The problem is that we are sending them more records than we ever agreed to. BNA's schedule, Dean Schmidt's estimate of the number of records, and BNA's estimated turn around time is what drives this process. UMC's Recon project and the GPO loads have sent this quota of records way over what was contracted for with BNA. Janet J. stated that the problem should also be reduced due to the fact that two projects being out at the same time was due to glitches (and not tardiness on BNA's part) in the processing. Once those projects are resolved, this shouldn't happen anymore.

   Mary Lou Culver (BNA) responded to Robin K. The best thing to do to get records back quicker, is to keep MESH and drop the manual review. MQCC will send a recommendation to ILS Coordinators group.

   BNA Subject Problem. An example was handed out. This has been happening since our first load! Our authority records have had the subfield "y" incorrectly updated. This is a pattern problem and has probably been repeated in other records as well. If anyone sees this updating error, he is to report it to Janet J. and give her examples of the error.

9. $2 IN FIELDS OTHER THAN 655 FIELD: Tabled due to time constraints.

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION:

   Linda H. Her campus has reported the following problem. When a staff person signs on as a patron, the system shows items but not checkin records. Thus, if a patron is logged in under the "library" login and is scoped, the patron will not be able to view checkin records. If you don't scope, then the checkin records display. The remote login scoping does not work correctly and this is a significant problem since 25% of III users are logging in using remote access. III needs to correct the scoping for remote access. Robin K. suggest that this is probably happening because the remote login is not assigned to the correct accounting unit when the patron logs in. MQCC asked that Linda forward this information to the LSO Helpdesk.

UMKC and SLU import many approval records delivered by a vendor service. Kathleen mentioned that staff should not be overlaying the non-OCLC records. You can recognize them because they have no OCLC number or Cataloging Date in the bibliographic record. Also, if you suppress order records and not the accompanying bibliographic records, the public sees only an order record without any bibliographic information. MASCC staff need to be aware of this. UMKC cataloging staff members are now allowed to unsupress these records as needed. Gary H. reminded us that we have only ONE load table for approval records. It is a cooperative venture! He has asked III to look into this matter. The load table only looks at ONE load template unless you tell it in the command line to use a different load table. However, you can't do this in an approval load. Locations are determined by information in the item record and that is what is used to code the location in the bibliographic record. Approval vendor put location information into a 949 or similar field. If you choose to suppress the bibliographic record, the items will not display.

Janet J. has requested an additional 40 review files. She has not gotten the work order, so the size of the individual files has not been specified as of yet. LSO will use the majority of these and those file sizes will be large. The remainder will be divided up into various smaller size files.

Robin K. asked Janet J. to make a print out all of our option groups before installing version 11 III software. When we upgraded the software the last time, all of the settings for the option groups returned to the default values.

Nancy S. mentioned that we have used 5,532,027 of 5,600,000 items records in the system, leaving only 67,973 item records available for system use. Several campuses have large projects going on so we will be using up the remaining item records in a short period of time. We need to buy more item records fairly soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 P.M. Rolla will be the recorder at the next meeting.