

Minutes  
SWAN Catalogers Meeting  
02-15-08

Members present: Gwen Gilpin, OTC; Raegan Wiechert, MSU; Sheila Ponder, MSU; Lisa McEowen, MSU; Linda Henderson, MSSU; Janet Wight, MSU; Mary Largent, Crowder; Marilyn McCroskey, MSU; Anna Beth Morgan, MSSU; Amy McCoy, BBC; Rose Scarlet, MSU-WP

Jeanne Besaw was not able to make it to the meeting because of transportation problems. So there was a round-table discussion of items on the preliminary agenda, and other items as they came up.

- 780/785 not displaying: MCO knows about it and a fix is on the staging server. (This problem has since been fixed. RS)
- 505 Contents notes do not display: If there are multiple 500 fields, only the first displays. MCO has been asked about this in the past, and it needs to be mentioned again. (This has been fixed. RS)
- Subject Headings: Discussed the changes in subject headings for video recordings and films. Question: Do we want to go back to "Video recordings for the hearing impaired" and "Video recordings for people with visual disabilities"? Consensus was to use these two headings (as opposed to "Films for..." ), but to run it by Public Services staff first. MSU will do the 'flip'. (Marilyn's email to David summarizes the discussion extremely well, so it is added to the end of the minutes. RS)
- Authority Reports: Robin had questions while training for FIPP, and because we were not sure about the answers we thought that it would be a good idea to have Robin come back and do a refresher training for SWAN. The May 2<sup>nd</sup> catalogers' meeting was suggested as a possible opportunity for that. It has been asked that any training for Forest Institute would be open to all SWAN libraries. Also, there is a procedure that could be run against the database that would prevent authority records with indicator errors from showing up on error reports. We need to see if it is still available, and if it is still priced reasonably (\$200 for the entire cluster). We need to officially ask to have it run. We were reminded that there was a decision years ago that we did not have to finish those initial boxes of authority reports.

- Actions: Marilyn will contact David Adams regarding 655 subject searching, subject headings for video recordings, authority reports and the authority record indicators procedure. Lisa McEowen will email an example of the MARS quarterly reports, and Linda Henderson will forward the emails she has received from Robin Kesphl.
- Next meeting: the next meeting is scheduled for 1:00 p.m. Friday, May 2<sup>nd</sup> at Cottey College.

Respectfully submitted by Rose Scarlet

02/26/08

\*\*\*\*\*

Marilyn's email to David Adams:

1. 655 searching  
 Earlier we had requested to have 655s included in subject searches. These are genre headings that used to be 650s but are now the new genre headings (what the item IS, rather than what it is ABOUT). As far as I know, 655s have been searchable only by keyword in our system. I know some OPACs other places have genre/form search as a separate search (but would patrons know what that is?) Have we requested to have 655s search by subject? Or is someone reviewing this request? We now are getting many OCLC records with 655s. For my AV headings, I have been changing these to 650 just so they will search by subject. Others in SWAN think we should leave them as 655 because someday they will search by subject. However, as far as we know right NOW, they don't. We thought when subject search on 655 started working, we could do global changes to the 650s that should be 655s. Most of what we have will be what the item IS, rather than what it is about. If we flip them all to 655, and think there could be works that are **about** this genre rather than are this genre, someone would just have to go through them one by one and change those **about** to 650. So, we need to know if 655s are now searchable in a subject search, or is this going to be possible soon? Some folks think the students don't use subject search anyway but just keyword, so maybe it doesn't matter; others of us think they should be searchable as subjects, especially headings in 2. below (e.g., to be able to bring up a list of closed-captioned videos).
2. Video headings, Films for the... versus Video recordings for the...  
 For a long time, when we had a closed captioned video (VHS or DVD), we added the subject heading, Video recordings for the hearing impaired. We have had a few for visually impaired that got Video recordings for people with visual disabilities. A short time ago, LC decided to change Video recordings for the hearing impaired to the heading, Films for the hearing impaired (same for the heading ...with visual disabilities). Our authority processing flipped all 3300 of the SWAN CC videos to the subject, Films for the hearing impaired. Then there was an outcry about LC's change, so LC decided to reinstate Video recordings for the... but leave as valid Films for the... and they also added Television programs for the hearing impaired, and all 3 headings are in LC's authority file as valid, no 5XX connecting them, either. The intent may have been to put all CC **movies** in Films for the..., and all CC TV programs in Television programs for the... (but

some non-movies are not TV programs either, so where do they go?), OR alternatively a library could choose to just put all CC videos in Video recordings for the hearing impaired the way we used to do. We now have 3300 records to go through if we wanted to sort out the movies into Films for the hearing impaired, TV programs into Television programs for the..., etc. The SWAN Catalogers discussed the options and thought the simpler the better, and would like to globally change Films for the hearing impaired back to Video recordings for the hearing impaired, and just put all CC video formats there the way we used to do. Does anyone object to this? We will need to tell media and public service people where to find these (i.e., where SWAN is putting such videos now; back where they used to be).

3. Authority reports

We had thought (from a prior conversation) that Robin Kespohl might come to the meeting, but she didn't (we thought she was in town training the FIPP cataloger). Several had questions about which authority reports we were supposed to be working through, and which ones we could say are too much trouble and just let them go. We'd like to know what reports are being sent out and why we need them. Some of this goes back to when Michelle and Heather were here, but some reports were deemed more trouble than they were worth (if so, then we don't need to receive them at all). We know Robin had questions about who was working on which reports and that she is training the FIPP cataloger on authority reports. Many of the SWAN Catalogers think we ALL need to meet with Robin, first to figure out what authority reports we really have to do and which can be ignored (dropped?), and secondly, to get review training on how to work on the authority reports (some are new at doing it). It was suggested that perhaps Robin could be invited to our May 2 meeting at Cottey, or if she thought it would take longer than that (or the need was more immediate than that), we could set up a separate meeting (sooner) for this. Probably you'd be the one to set this up with Robin.

4. Authority records with stray 2<sup>nd</sup> indicators

Some time ago, we thought the coordinators were going to discuss paying to have these stray indicators taken out (\$200 for the cluster stuck in our minds as the cost), and someone said they thought the coordinators did approve this. Where do we stand with this? Or did we dream it?