

Minutes of the MQCC meeting

Date: Jan. 29, 1997

Present: R. Amelung (SLU Law); R. McBride, J. Huang (SLU Pius); L. Hulbert (SLU HSC); S. Coleman, R. Kespohl, N. Fair (MU Ellis); N. Stancel, J. McKinney (UMKC Law); G. Ho, T. James (UMR); K. Schweitzberger (UMKC); E. Grewe, D. Owens (UMSL); J. Addison (UMC HSL); J. Jackson, D. Schmidt, V. Lee, G. Harris, G. Rickerson (LSO)

1. The following changes were made to the Minutes of the meeting of the Dec. 9th:

- 1) the date of the meeting was adjusted to Dec. 9th
- 2) the batchload codes should be for uploading bib. records to OCLC rather than for reinstatement.

2) Schweitzberger explained the membership composition of the MQCC which follows the pattern established by the MERLIN directors. Each campus may have 3 members each. Additionally, observers may attend. Although the intent is that we achieve consensus in all decisions, should a vote need to be taken, each campus may have 1 vote. Caucusing may be necessary. Campuses may NOT split their vote.

3) Schweitzberger and Amelung were nominated to chair the new, reconstituted QCC. Amelung declined; Schweitzberger agreed to serve as chair for another year and was elected by acclamation.

4) LSO UPDATE:

a) Rickerson gave the following report:

In regard to the III fix for sparse scopes, barcode validation, and simultaneous printing: The first two are working as expected. The third is in test at present. The hold up is in the pattern recognition for patrons. Rickerson reiterated the barcode validation will NOT take place in tech. services when the number is brought into MERLIN via the OCLC export function, tape load or FTP. Validation occurs only when the number is input directly into MERLIN. The system will allow you to enter an invalid number, but it will tell you it's bad. You may store it in its invalid form. The inputter will need to edit the field to correct the barcode. There is no release date (from LSO testing) for this function yet.

Hulbert stated that sparse scopes retrieval did not appear to be working. Rickerson stated that that had not been his experience; he found only a 10 second delay in retrieval. Hulbert will investigate. Rickerson would like to see an enhancement that would provide for the system to prompt the user to select a "same search unscoped" option.

Concerning the printing schedule, it appears that some collapsing may be possible but that the Circulation sites will have to coordinate this. It was reported that today Ellis finished its notice printing at 8:20 am.

There are four load projects. (Kurt is almost finished with the missing items from LUMIN.) They are: GPO records from LUMIN; 930s; MU retrocon records; 010 load. Rickerson has ordered the load profile for the 1976-(350,000) Autographics records. They are to be loaded with Bcode3 set to suppress. He requested help with the load decision since there is the possibility that there will be duplication with existing records in MERLIN. Fair recalled that the Autographics records do contain OCLC control numbers. Currently, the decision is that these records will be "inserted".

Washington University Libraries (Olin and departmentals, sans Law and Medical) has signed with III. Their projected date to be up on the system is in fall 1997.

Rickerson discussed the three database maintenance programs that LSO runs: rearrange items by location, update locations (i.e., link item to bib.), scope authorities. The first two CANNOT be run simultaneously. Currently, each of the three takes about a week to run through the entire database. At ALA Midwinter, Rickerson plans to talk to T. Jacobson and J. Kline to find out if these problems can be addressed. At any given time parts of the database are two or three weeks out of date. As it stands now, Rickerson observed that a scoped database penalizes the patron since the database is never in "sync". Discussion continued on this topic focusing on the ability to run these programs against only those records which need it rather than the entire file. Harris will investigate this possibility. The goal would be to do a daily run with these programs.

The MERLIN directors want the patron request function turned on ASAP. This needs to be made clear to all the MERLIN libraries.

Harris made the following reported that, in answer to MQCC's request for shorter labels for volume, barcode, identity, III said that they can be changed but that such a change will also be evident in the public display when a particular item line is requested for extended display. Schweitzberger to refer to MRSC for their approval.

BNA loads of both bib. and authorities are done.

b) Schmidt made the following comments:

Of the 1995-96 imprints BNA returned to MERLIN, 67% were endowed with TOCs.

During the original load, all bib. records needed an item record in order to store the call number. Schmidt asked that we remind our staffs to reuse this skeletal record as a true item record or else delete it if "complete" item records are created for the title.

He distributed the no match and changed authorities lists.

c) Schweitzberger brought the following items to the committee's attention:

The MARC tag validation table is pre-format integration. When one asks to verify MARC codes, a code may be incorrectly approved. Schweitzberger volunteered to review and revise the tables.

BNA has the 1997 MeSH. It will be reflected in the next BNA shipment.

Verify headings problem was reported to III yesterday.

Rolla has a new barcode prefix of 051 which is used for temporary barcodes on unbound serial issues. If a cataloging site begins using a new prefix, be sure to notify LSO to ensure that there will be no changes which affect the smooth operation of the entire system. As a courtesy, it would be well to inform the other cataloging sites too.

Concerning the passwording of the 100-200 functions, Jackson is checking with III to determine if there is a list which relates these more discrete functions with those in the 0-99 series. This seems doubtful due to the implementation options available at each installation.

Other topics mentioned included:

Circulation may now edit item variable fields, but this function seems to be somewhat inconsistent. It may be a question of local passwording.

LUMIN will be available until Feb. 1997. Some committee members stressed how helpful it was in order to resolve muddled records, missing local authority records, etc. Rickerson will check to see if availability could be extended until June 1997.

Concerning the duplication of the LOCATION field on bib. records, the cause is unclear. Please continue to monitor these incidences and report them.

Kespohl felt that the normalization pattern is not functioning properly in the character-by-character call numbers. Schmidt felt, to the contrary, that it was working exactly as described in the manual, but that the manual was ambiguous and provided III an "out".

Schweitzberger pointed out a problem with the exporting of authority records. It appears that the 001(ARN) is being brought into MERLIN with the oca prefix. Furthermore, it was unclear if the 001 and 010 were both being indexed and precisely where. It was agreed that the 010 (LCCN) |a and |z both be indexed on authority records.

Kespohl stated that numerous "invalid" headings were being reported when an acronym (410) matched a perfectly valid subj. hdg. Some attention must be made to such occurrences so that the patron is not led to a valid but unwanted heading.

Kespohl recommended and it was agreed that we allow for the editing of

records in different modules. She will forward the recommendation to the Coordinators list. Coordinators will refer to their Serials/Acquisitions representatives who will have a week to offer a negative response.

McBride stated that, during the record transfer process, sites should feel free to disregard local note statements on XII records which refer to the disposition of materials (e.g., FOR HOLDINGS ASK AT SERIALS DEPARTMENT; CURRENT VOLUME ON REFERENCE).

5) Action on MERLIN standards:

Draft standard for the resolution of monographic duplicates presented by Amelung was approved with revision. When the revised draft is completed, he will forward it to the MQCC list for any final comments.

Draft standard for the resolution of serial duplicates will be revised by Schweitzberger and reposted to the list. It was recommended that it include a statement concerning the referral of the transfer action to holding sites who may have to adjust their records.

6) Schmidt is waiting for a decision concerning blind references. It was agreed that 1) if there is no longer a bib. record which carries the 1XX authority heading, the authority records ASUPPRESS should be set to "d" (e.g., suppress and send to BNA to be deleted); 2) if the authority record's 1XX represents a parent record which needs to be retained to support a subordinate body, it should be so coded. Kespohl will write guidelines to handle blind references. When resolving supposed duplicates in the authority file, be sure to check that the heading is "duplicated" on purpose since it occurs in both the author and the subject indexes.

7) In the future, LSO will sort the duplicate barcode number report list by location.

8) Hulbert requested that sites having established, written workflow procedures share same.

9) McBride requested that a new IMESSAGE be added. The new value would be "a". It would be defined in the system as "ACCOMP MAT". Users are reminded that one may also use an "m" field in the item record which also prompts at point of circulation and provides for more variation in description of accompanying material.

10) Schweitzberger will draft a document concerning vendor-supplied bibliographic records.

11) Kespohl and Fair will draft a standard for handling short runs of dead serials and multivolume sets with the guidelines of when the use of inactive checkin records is appropriate in these cases.

12) Jackson provided information concerning how MERLIN sites may report holdings back to OCLC. There is a group account with separate codes for each cataloging site that report the holdings to separate

files. Pricing received yesterday would appear to be reasonable and allow us to start as soon as the profiling is done. A separate profile document must be filed for each OCLC symbol (e.g., 12 in all). OCLC had lowered the cost to \$200/code for evaluation. LSO is willing to cover this one-time fixed cost. Records would be pulled once a week. (That is OCLC's guideline). The committee requested that LSO handle pulling the records. Records received from vendors would require a separate OCLC evaluation. OCLC expects to get an OCLC record number on each bib. record. There is an annual fee of \$450 which LSO is willing to cover. Jackson will contact each cataloging site for any more information that she needs.

Icode1 numerical codes will be assigned to each cataloging site.

13) The materials booking function is available to all. Schweitzberger suggested that MQCC members, especially UMSL, look at the function. Do we still need a standard for collection-level records?

The next MQCC meeting will be held on Feb. 26th.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard C. Amelung
Saint Louis University Law Library