Minutes of MQCC meeting for July 14, 1999

Present: N. Fair, chair (MU-Ellis), A. Zaidman (SLU Pius), P. Logsdon (WU), R. Amelung
(SLU-Law), D. Owens (UMSL), J. Carter (SLU-HSC), P. McCarthy (SLU-Pius), N. Stancel
(UMKC-Law), G. Swindells (MU-Ellis), W. Fritzel (MU-HSL), V. Sha (MU-Ellis), L. Hunter
(UMR), A. Holdaway (UMR), A. Sylvester (UMKC), K. Schweitzberger (UMKC), G. Harris
(LSO), B. Heidlage (LSO), C. Gould (LSO), J. Jackson (LSO)

 Norma introduced Wendy Fritzel, cataloger at UMColumbia, Health Sciences Library.

 Corrections to minutes of June 9th:
- correction of names Gary Harris and Anna Sylvester throughout
- item 7, correction of OrLoB-B
- letter A. MOBIUS, test pac. Include Westminster College

 LSO update
GH: Mobius continues apace.
LSO is about to roll out the proxy server for testing. Documentation will be sent
to MRSC with URLs for testing. It is broken down to library level. The
proxy server cannot read the URL in the 856. If a library needs locally
available materials controlled, those URLs should be sent to someone at
LSO (as specified in documentation) for inclusion in that librarys pac
file.

CG: The 18 month backfile of WLN is loaded. Dups and blinds references will be
distributed next week. Record count as follows:

Type	Total	Duplicates
Name	51,690	3,334
Title	5,004	1,707
LC subj.	10,339	1,065
MeSH	7,034	5,898

WLN and BNA have agreed to a procedure for handling TOC enrichment and
authority transfers. Tentative procedures were reviewed. Gould will link
the document to the MQCC page.
The remaining backfile will be sent to WLN/BNA during the first two weeks of
August.
K. Schweitzberger brought up the question of authority records with prefixes in the 001.
This may account for the high number of false duplicates. V. Sha suggested that LSO verify
match points with WLN to investigate this duplication. W. Fritzel asked that LSO find out the
year of MeSH that WLN is using.

JJ: J. Jackson asked that determination be made concerning the status of action items
      for which MQCC members are responsible. The committee took time at
       this point to review the list.

N. Fair asked that the series authority/serial contact person list be added to the link.

Jackson put up Standard 10.1. Discussion ensued concerning colors and font size on the
new displays for the MERLIN standards. It was suggested that indentions be kept to a minimum
and that colors be changed to black unless the text represents a hyperlink.
JJ: Report on Linkbot.

-Jackson suggested that we restrict checking to http and gopher because purls
will always come up as errors.
 In the future, libraries should include LSO in local licensing agreements to enable
them to check the links.
 Jackson needs to communicate to D. Martin to verify the programming on his
local program to determine why data was missing on the Linkbot report (e.g., title, .b numbers).
 Schweitzberger suggested that each cataloging center establish a separate bib
location for these electronic resources.
 Exclude all GPO records since GPO will reissue faulty URLs and correct
PURLs. All PURLs should be excluded.

LSO to reinvestigate the parameters for pulling 856s.

V. Sha reported on the RFP for GPO MARC records. The following changes were
suggested:
 include the fact that we only want item records on shipping list bibs. NOT on the
full MARC records.
 7.5.1 changed to add a minimum of 100 test records.
 5.1.7 move to highly desirable.

GR: Concerning the RFP in general: Rickerson was uneasy that there are too many
mandatories since, once mandatory, if the vendor cannot comply, the vendor can
no longer participate in the selection process. Points can be assigned to the
desirable and it will be on those points that the award can be made. E.g., cost =
50%, desirables plus financial viability = 50%. Furthermore, we must decide who
does the scoring. We can indicate that any vendor scoring below a certain level in
the desirables category will be excluded from consideration.

It was decided that the Subcommittee would determine the division between mandatory
and desirable and draw up a point scheme. They will present their suggestions to the Committee.

AH: Hindman was available for comments concerning Project MUSE. Although the
        number of titles doubled, the cost more than doubled. MERLIN will
        continue to acquire the existing titles, but will not be able to acquire new
        ones. FYI: the subscription year is the calendar year.
OCLC PSP titles can be renewed, including new titles. Each campus needs to
verify the titles to ensure accuracy. Contacts should send results to V. Sha
 by July 23rd. FYI: the subscription year is August 1st- July 31st.   Questions
concerning availability should be sent to Axie. Newly available titles need
to be checked as well. After renewal is complete, someone on each
campus needs to verify that full text is truly available. Cataloging centers
are encouraged to complete this project by August 13th. (Dont forget to
add the appropriate 655 and 730's.)

PMC: McCarthy announced the future major loads for the Early American Imprints sets
        that SLU Pius has acquired. Series 1 and 2 together will represent the
addition of 72,000 bibliographic records. Records for the first series will   be
from the American Antiquarian Society; series 2 are from OCLC. SLU   Pius
will send the appropriate documentation for load characteristics to the   list for
informational purposes.

Concerning Bcode 3: "m" and "t" should be deleted. A. Sylvester will rapid update Bcode
            3 from "b" to "-" and notify J. Jackson to remove m, t, and b code definitions from

the system.

Standard 8.2.5: A. Zaidman suggested an additional wording to clarify the electronic
    resources mentioned. She also suggested that the order of 8.2.5.1.2 and 8.2.5.1.3
    be reversed.
V. Sha presented a revision of 8.2.4.1.4. After some discussion, she will revise her
    suggestions and send them to Janet to be inserted.

There is no need to divide the work for Project MUSE titles since we cannot acquire these
titles any how.

Some centers need time to clean up local authority adds. Gould will compile separate
local name, title and subject files to provide extra time for clean up.

Although a suggestion was put forward concerning the possibility of protecting some
fields on authority records so as to allow for automatic overlay, Sha pointed out that this could
cause problems with non-unique names.

ACTION ITEM: LSO to inquire if any cost would be associated with creation of protected 5XX,
4XX, and 690 fields on authority records.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Amelung