SWAN Cluster Cataloging Committee minutes, June 6, 2000, 9:30-11:30 a.m., Drury

Present: Barbara Schade (Crowder), Phyllis Holzenberg (Drury), Linda Henderson (MSSC), Gwen Gilpin (OTC), Corky McCormack (OTC), Stella Cunningham (SBU), Coleen Rose (SBU), Karen Letarte (SMSU), Michelle Turvey (SMSU), Rose Scarlet (SMSU-WP).

The meeting began with a discussion of membership and representation on the SWAN Cataloging Committee. The general consensus was that each institution should have one vote, however, an institution may have more than one person on the committee. Karen, by consensus, was chosen as the Chair of the Cataloging Committee for the SWAN cluster.

Linda suggested that the minutes, agendas, questions, etc. be posted to MOBSW-L. It was also suggested that the subject line contain the word "cataloging" in order to alert committee members and others on the list. At this time, no separate cataloging discussion list will be created for the committee.

A discussion was begun on the topic of the division of labor on database maintenance. Work could be divided by alphabetical order or by size, with size being the preferred means. Local database maintenance for problem areas previously identified will occur at each institution. Items can also be suppressed and prevented from loading at the INN-Reach level for as yet to be determined areas (e.g. vertical files, etc.). The committee will also need to decide what items should receive minimal and full level cataloging.

Interest was expressed in receiving additional training and handouts on the create list and rapid update functions. Corky mentioned a presentation given by Donna Baker of the Springfield-Greene County Library, Kearney branch at the recent Innovative User's Group meeting. It was also stated that MCO might be able to provide additional training.

The upcoming SWAN cluster serials training will be split with different institutions training with different members of the Archway cluster at two separate sessions.

The 949 1_ field was briefly discussed. SMSU is currently using the 949 1_ field to add the barcode, etc. Method 2 is preferred by MCO.

The issue of provisional records for items created on the fly, on order with no OCLC copy, etc. was discussed. Questions were also raised concerning how provisional records could be overlayed. Can an overlay be forced or does one need to dump the new record and move the order, paid, received record from the provisional to the full record? Karen will check with Robin Kespohl on this.

For the next meeting, the suggestion was made to check the Web for possible III training documentation. Linda expressed the need for everyone to look over the MERLIN standards at
http://merlin.missouri.edu/lso/standard/mqcc_standards.htm
in order to begin discussing shared cataloging standards in the SWAN cluster.
On the topic of reserves, how should on the fly circulation records be added? Should the records be done in MARC? Templates are available to assist circulation staff in the creation of on-the-fly records.

Authority control

According to Jim Dutton, there will be a review file before the authority file is sent to the vendor

for authority processing. Here, institutions can review the contents and remove items not need authority processing (e.g. reserve materials) from the file being sent.

BNA and enhanced table of contents
The issue of enhanced table of contents was discussed. Concern was voiced over whether or not BNA would provide

TOCs for all of the items in need. Karen suggested initially using an Icode2 with a "c" (c=contents) to flag likely candidates. A report could then be generated after an agreed upon time to review the items confirming BNA enhancements covering all items needing TOCs. It was also suggested that one should begin using enhanced 505s.
505 00 $g Miscellaneous information (including initial article)
$t Title
$r statement of responsibility

Other policy discussions
Karen suggested following the appropriate LCRIs and omitting initial articles for all series and 740 fields. She also reminded everyone of the importance of omitting initial articles from $t (especially in added author-title entries).

Everyone was also reminded not to remove additional subject headings (AC headings, MESH, etc.). Robin Kespohl will wait until there are enough of these headings in the database to force a separate index.

Should records be edited in III or in OCLC? This is a workflow issue and will be decided by each individual institution.

Committee members expressed interest in maintaining local authority records. The matter of how each institution provides access to children's award books was discussed. The general consensus was to keep a local series authority for award books in an 830. The 4xx is reserved for the transcription of the series.

The cluster will need to decide how multiple manifestations of an item will be handled in order to provide consistency (e.g. microform vs. paper form). How will the holdings be handled?

Karen suggested preferring a serial record to a monographic record for items with identical titles not needing analysis. The serials record would also be easier for check-ins.

For next meeting
Continue discussion on division of labor
Begin discussing merging duplicates
Review MERLIN cataloging standards

Minutes submitted by M. Turvey