MOBIUS Inn Reach Catalog Best Practices Task Force – 07-15-2014

Members:
Donna Bacon, MCO
Lynn Cline, MSU, MCMAC
Michael Davis, Camden County, MCDAC
Lisa Farrell, East Central, MCMAC
Kathleen Schweitzberger, UMKC, MCDAC
Stephen Wynn, Truman State, MCDAC

The task force met twice: on 2 April at MCO and again on 3 June at the MOBIUS Conference. In addition, one of the outcomes of the first session was deference to MCDAC for discussion and drafting of guidelines regarding the addition of items to the Union Catalog. That group subsequently met and developed some broad recommendations. Much credit goes to Inn Reach task force members Stephen Davis, Kathleen Schweitzberger, and Stephen Wynn, who also serve on MCDAC, as well as to Stephen Wynn for drafting on behalf of MCDAC.

Charge: To create a best practices document to guide the addition of records into the MOBIUS Union Catalog. The task force will address the following issues:

- ***Is the union catalog a catalog of available items or a discovery tool?***
- ***When and how items should be added to the union catalog?***
- ***Discuss the continuation of authority control in the Union catalog***
- ***Guidelines for making records visible/suppressed or requestable/non-requestable.***
- ***Other issues that arise as a result of the above discussions.***

- ***Is the union catalog a catalog of available items or a discovery tool?***

  The union catalog is a discovery tool.

  a. Member libraries should make every effort to contribute as much material as possible.
  b. The consortium should take efforts to mitigate as much as possible issues involving non-requestable items and duplicate records.
  c. Some possible approaches to "non-requestability."
     1. Vigorously pursue a software solution through the Innovative enhancement ballot process, specifically to develop a means to limit, sort, or search requestable items only.
     2. Explore and utilize the features of Encore that lend themselves to more easily identifying materials that are requestable.
  d. The consortium should explore Innovative's Matchpoint software with respect to capability to reduce duplication of records.

- ***When and how items should be added to the union catalog?***

Recommendation for adding titles to the union catalog

The task force's vision of the union catalog as a discovery tool includes the maxim that "Member libraries should make every effort to contribute as much material as possible." Users should be able to find all available materials, whether those materials are available for request via courier, or available on-site to users willing to visit the owning library in person. In this context, libraries are encouraged to contribute records for noncirculating and local-use only materials if the materials are available to walk-in patrons for on-site use.

However, there are several situations in which it is not desirable to contribute a record to the union catalog, particularly when following MOBIUS requirements, recommendations or best policies. In some cases, records may have been licensed for use only in the local or cluster catalog in which case the library is legally barred from contributing records to the union catalog. More generally, if a record represents material that is not available to consortium members under any circumstances then it is appropriate to consider not sending the record to the union catalog. Such records may include:

- Records that do not correspond to any item in the collection, for example:
    - test records
    - dummy records created at implementation
    - records for materials never received
- Records for items not currently available to any users, for example:
    - records for withdrawn, lost & billed, or claimed returned items
    - on-the-fly records
    - records kept solely for statistical purposes or staff procedures
    - records for materials for digitization only
    - surrogates for circulation
    - extra items for scoping
- Records for items not owned by the library, for example:
    - records for personal copies
    - records for photocopied articles
    - records for items owned by other campus departments
    - records for ILL loans
- Records for items available only to the library's own patrons or a subset thereof, for example:
    - records for course reserves
    - records for items held at overseas sites
    - records for items that the vendor/supplier licenses only for local use
    - records for equipment, study room keys, or other services offered only to a library's own users

- Records for items whose discovery in the union catalog is accomplished by other means

- Records for non-requestable materials when holdings are represented by a checkin record (e.g., items for periodical volumes)
- Records for consortially-purchased ebook collections

This list and the examples are not exhaustive.

- ***Discuss the continuation of authority control in the Union catalog***

  The sense among the task force was to continue unless there are overriding reasons not to. This sense is countered by the amount of time required to process the Union Catalog authority file (6 mos.) and the amount of MCO personnel time devoted to that process that could be utilized elsewhere.

- ***Guidelines for making records visible/suppressed or requestable/non-requestable.***

  In general, when a library determines that a certain record (bibliographic, item, serial, check-in, order) should not display in the union catalog, this should be achieved by not sending the record (code *s* or *z*) rather than by suppressing the record (code l or n).

- ***How e-books should be handled in light of the answers to the questions above.***

  In addition to the examples noted above there is the question of e-books and similar materials whose accessibility is restricted. Generally, records for e-books purchased by an individual should be sent to the union catalog except for consortially-purchased e-books whose records would be loaded by MCO. To improve matching of ebook records in the union catalog, MCO has purchased the Enhanced Matchpoint product, and another group is currently configuring Enhanced Matchpoint for implementation.