

## Catalogers Group Meeting, June 6, 2002 Minutes

**Present:** Gia Aivazian, Sharon Benamou, Elie Chammou, Valerie Bross, Joan LoPear, Janice Matthiesen, Renée McBride, Luiz Mendes, Caroline Miller, Jeff Morehead, Paul Priebe, John Riemer, Rita Stumps

### I. Announcements

John Riemer announced that the Catalog Dept. will meet with Pat Hawthorne on Thursday, June 27, 2002, 2:30-3:30 pm in the ACR.

John also announced that the next Catalogers Group meeting will be July 11, 2002 (ALA reports from Valerie, John, Janice, Beth, Angela).

### II. CONSER Operations Committee meeting (Valerie Bross)

Valerie distributed a meeting summary put together by Jean Hiron. The handout includes the URL for the website that contains fuller information.

Four main points were addressed at the meeting, which took place at the Library of Congress in early May:

- 1) AACR2r
- 2) committee reports
- 3) discussion of issues, especially e-serials
- 4) organizational matters, especially the question of CONSER conforming to the BIBCO model of having only a few representatives at meetings instead of all members. CONSER members are against this proposal, for the reason that cycling members off the committee every 2-3 years doesn't allow those members to have enough time to get up to speed and feel comfortable expressing their opinions.

3/4 of the first day of the meeting were devoted to changes to AACR2 Chapter 12, especially in the areas of title proper, numbering, and edition information.

Questions addressed regarding e-serials:

- 1) What should we do when the title of an e-serial changes and all earlier issues have new title?
- 2) Should we implement 1.11A (reproductions)?
- 3) Should we catalog online versions of print serials?

Becky Culbertson (UCSD) and Kate Harcourt (Columbia University) respectively created lists of available record sets for serial and monographic titles contained in aggregator packages. CONSER supports this effort wholeheartedly and would like for the information to be made available as a clearinghouse through CONSER. The URL for the list is:

<http://library.ucsd.edu/~becky/AggregatorList.htm>

The PURL project was well-received. The project, which showed how beneficial the PURL server can be, received permission to continue. Participants get credit for creation/maintenance of PURLs.

For further information, see the summary at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/conop2002.html>

### III. OTNG Report (John Riemer) and group discussion

John announced that in mid-July we will receive a survey in which we may give our opinions regarding the importance of various elements of the new system we are in the process of

choosing. We are encouraged to give weighting to non-discriminator, as well as discriminator categories, in the cataloging modules. The survey will be quite long, but we need only address the areas in which we work. We may be asked to pare down our choices to our 5 most crucial choices.

We may also consider the questions of whether any categories have been overlooked in OTNG's report and whether any categories are too cluttered, needing to be split up into more discrete categories. The deadline for submitting opinions regarding these questions is Friday, June 21, 2002. Send your thoughts to Caroline Miller.

John reported on Sara Shatford Layne's suggestions regarding elements of the OPAC that warrant cataloger attention:

- 1) keyword in/on heading search
- 2) browse heading search
- 3) basic keyword in record searching
- 4) limiting searches
- 5) stop words
- 6) exact searching
- 7) numeric searching other than call number
- 8) combined author/uniform title or title headings search index
- 9) sorting of numbers in a list display other than call numbers
- 10) analytics
- 11) ability to search local information in holdings records
- 12) proximity searching
- 13) truncation/wildcards
- 14) nested searching
- 15) normalization
- 16) bound withs
- 17) URL link checking
- 18) MARC record manipulation tools

John noted that e-resource aspects are buried in and scattered throughout the OTNG report.

Catalogers Group weighted the following elements of the system:

- 1) keyboard equivalents: important (for macros to be possible)
- 2) general impression: no opinion
- 3) display of single bibliographic record: nice to have
- 4) global change: crucial
- 5) individual record import: nice to have
- 6) printing: important
- 7) local save file: nice to have
- 8) searching: can't rate, too general  
but pull out Stop Button as separate category: important
- 9) sorting: what is the default sort?  
Flexibility of sorting: crucial
- 10) macros: important

Submitted by Renée McBride