

Catalogers group
 June 7, 2001
 Minutes

Present: J. Riemer, C. Miller, S. Wiskoff, J. Morehead, J. Matthiesen, R. McBride, L. Mendes, R. Stumps, J. Rashedi, B. Feinberg, V. Bross, L. Ratliff, G. Aivazian (recorder)

The first agenda item was a demonstration of OCLC's CATME as a tool for accomplishing cataloging work. Luiz Mendes made this presentation as a follow-up to Valerie Bross' report on the future of cataloging on OCLC at our previous meeting.

OCLC has stated support for Passport may end as early as August 2001, making use of CATME one of two suggested alternatives. The demonstration showed that CATME had some interesting and useful features. The most impressive of these proved to be the cataloging in so-called "batch mode", e.g. through a string of OCLC numbers one could bring in as many as 100 records at a time, then go off-line, deal with individual details and return online to finalize updates.

Local#	Author	Title	Control#	Date	v	d	p	d	e	r	s	z	l	e
473	Varillas Monsieur Antoine	anecdotes de Florence ou	25280764	1689	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
213	Delvaux Andre 1569-1636	Andreae Vallensis vulgo d	25234708	1658	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
282	Villedieu Madame de d 168	Anaxandre nouvelle	25268250	1667	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
559	Bartholin Thomas 1616-168	Anatome quartum renovata	22049097	1677	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
503	Dufresny Charles Riviere	Amusemens serieux et comi	25272887	1699	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
504	Dufresny Charles Riviere	Amusemens serieux et comi	25268168	1699	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
587	Tristan LHermitte Francois	amovrs de Tristan	23934352	1638	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
281	Tristan LHermitte Francois	amovrs de fev Mr Tristan	25280679	1662	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
582	Scudery M de Georges 1601	amour tyrannique tragi-co	24249642	1638	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
368	Tasso Torquato 1544-1595	Aminte dv Tasse Pastorale	25279817	1681	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
367	Tasso Torquato 1544-1595	Aminte du Tasse Pastorale	25280449	1676	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
638	Tasso Torquato 1544-1595	Aminta favola boscareccia	24222034	1655	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
185	Sanson Nicolas 1600-1667	Ameriqve en plvsievrs car	25308587	1657	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
345	Moliere 1622-1673	amans magnifiques comedie	25282399	1684	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
425	Le Noble Eustache 1643-17	allee de la Seringue ou L	25274469	1690	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
581	Scudery M de Georges 1601	Alaric ov Rome vaincue Po	23615441	1656	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
580	Scudery M de Georges 1601	Alaric ou Rome vaincue Po	24249637	1685	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	Naude Gabriel 1600-1653	Advis povr dresser vne bi	27049228	1627	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
527	Naude Gabriel 1600-1653	Advis pour dresser une bi	25279296	1876	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
273	Roye Francois de d 1686	Ad titulum de ivre patron	25254714	1667	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
71	Ortelius Abraham 1527-159	Abrege dv Theatre Contena	25254225	1602	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
525	Mezeray Francois Eudes de	Abrege chronologique de l	25279349	1696	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
304	Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin	Abraham Ou La vie parfait	25254467	1680	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

If multiple records are selected as above, steps like editing the 049, adding the 910 field, applying a constant data record, setting a flag to have the records updated (holdings symbol set) can be done on all the records simultaneously via a single command. This tool promises to be most useful to copy catalogers whose productivity could be enhanced.

Next on the agenda was John Riemer's report on the June 5 ACC meeting with Stephen Schwartz of LIS on questions of "Access Integration."

Stephen is UCLA's rep on a statewide "Task Force on Access Integration." He is greatly concerned about the proliferation of databases on campus and elsewhere designed to provide different kinds of information about electronic resources. He would like to see as few databases as possible. There are too many places to look for what you want, and duplication of effort is wasteful. He was a guest at this week's ACC meeting for an exchange of ideas.

Within academic libraries there is interest in providing at least 3 different kinds of access to e-resources. Given the strong public interest in these materials this is not seen as unreasonable. The resources are new enough that you could argue we don't yet know how users would prefer to search for them.

- 1) The one-stop shopping of the OPAC offers convenience.
- 2) Search engines available right on library home pages give users a chance to isolate just the e-resources and search against descriptions of them.
- 3) Browsable lists arranged by title or subject category are often perceived as easier to use or produce than the other two methods—at least until the number of entries grows out of hand.

In light of perceptions about what is easier for or more preferred by patrons, it probably would be foolhardy to push for just one means of access. The one access tool we put so much energy into might not get chosen. It is awfully easy to scroll. Patrons might like the familiarity of searching in Google/AltaVista fashion and retrieving just the carefully-selected resources. So, it is more strategic to concede the desirability, for now, of having all three access methods and then to make the case that the catalog records could actually feed the other two access methods. ACC members argued along these lines, pointing out the waste of energy it is for library staff to duplicate intellectual effort to organize the resources. Why reinvent the wheel if most or all the data needed for the search engine or the webpage listings already exists in the MARC records?

For constructing the searchable database, our records probably have the information-rich fields LIS needs: 245, 6XX, name access points, and the increasingly popular 520.

For generating the browse lists, the **titles** are straightforward. For **subject** lists, there are a number of possibilities. The subject headings could actually be used as is. If the detail is too great, more general headings can come from multiple approaches. You could copy what's in the cataloging record and pare back on the subdivisions. If that is still too specific, a machine could refer to the LCSH authority records and move up the BT hierarchy a time or two to reach a broader heading. Library committees could create an subject category listing, based on an existing thesaurus or the names of the majors currently offered on campus or some combination. (At Georgia this proved rather laborious. After agreement is reached on vocabulary, some staff have to install the additional fields, e.g as 690s, in the records in order to support the browsing.)

Another category of browsing is by genre. The terms could be taken from 655s in the record, based on standard lists or on a locally-created set of terms. The latter is hard work, as Martha Yee can testify from FATA's experiences. Genre term browsing can be separated from other subject searching or blended in.

Of course, the 6XX fields are only one method of providing access to the subject matter of e-resources. Classification represents another built-in method cataloging records offer for subject indexing. Cyberstacks

<http://www.public.iastate.edu/~CYBERSTACKS/hybrow-all.htm>

shows the browsing that is possible thanks to 050/090 fields.

Columbia University maps the various classification ranges to captions on browsable lists.

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/libraries/inside/projects/metadata/classify/>

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/libraries/inside/projects/metadata/classify/models/>

If the captions are ever found objectionable for public use, e.g. C = Auxiliary Sciences of History, public services staff should feel free to “translate” to something better.

How to get the data out of our OPAC is another issue. The only extract program we have, for shipping copies of our records to Melvyl is something DRA had to write for us. Exporting from CORC copies of bib records we have symbol on is another possibility, but the master record may not reflect our local editing or the URLs our patrons need to use. Another possibility is retaining a copy of those ORION2 extracts we send to Melvyl, so that we can pluck out the e-resource records for LIS’ needs.

Extracts of cataloging records is not the only way to supply the browse searching. At Georgia, the Web Task Force was planning to have dynamic searching done directly against the key fields, 653 & 655. Voyager had subject searching that could target a particular MARC tag. Browsable lists would actually be comprised of clickable subject categories. The link a patron would click on consisted of a very long URL that embedded a highly specific search directly into the OPAC.

UCSD is one example of an institution using the content of catalog records to drive the updating of other access methods: <http://libnet.ucsd.edu/portal/tools/updating.html>

It was particularly gratifying to see catalogers redirecting the potential “competition” of computer programmer initiatives right back through the heart of our daily output. Historically, the catalog has been at the crossroads of the other activity that goes on in the library. ACC members made the case that this could continue to be true in this new setting. On a short- and long-term basis, we offered to help him achieve his aims and show our records can play a part. That was the most significant part of that 2-hour meeting.

One thing that did not get covered was what challenges we would face as catalogers if we get our wish and LIS takes up our offer to have its strategy heavily or exclusively reliant on our work. Ones that John foresees:

Coverage: An examination of how many of the resources, selected for inclusion on other sites like bibliographer web-page listings, are already in the OPAC will show a high percentage of them there, *thanks to all the efforts in the Cataloging Department.*

Workload: If the Department is not going to receive an infusion of new positions (right away) to help with the work, we need to utilize as many shortcuts and efficiencies as we can think of

--adding URLs to records for paper or other hard-copy versions

--adding a URL to an authority record in lieu of creating a bibliographic record

- harvesting metadata with tools like CORC offers
- creatively collaborating with helpers we can find and train, e.g. "BibCORC"
- reconsidering how we do other work, like a possible change of the national standard to latest-entry serials cataloging

Timeliness: Can we get our records into the OPAC fast enough? We might need to use an IP-record approach with subsequent overlay.

At the end of John's presentation, there was further discussion on the expectations of users, our ability to anticipate them and, most importantly, to satisfy them. Before deciding to serve up e-resources in a certain way, a determination of the true information needs of users should be made, to inform the strategies and projects we undertake. We must ask the question as to whether we are really providing our patrons' needs, as service goals must be our end. Valerie also pointed out that in an environment of reduced personnel, compromises between adequate access and ideal access have already been introduced.

There was more discussion in this, especially in the realm of various communities of information needs.

Next meeting will be in two weeks (June 21) devoted entirely to ALA reports.