

Catalogers Group Minutes  
February 13, 2003  
2:30-3:30 pm.

Attending: Gia Aivazian, Sharon Benamou, Kathy Brill, Valerie Bross, Beth Feinberg, Janice Matthiesen (recorder), Luiz Mendes, Caroline Miller, Hao Phan, Paul Priebe, Louise Ratliff, John Riemer, Angela Riggio, Rita Stumps.

1. Report on AdCon meeting of Feb. 12 – John Riemer

A. Last Friday ExComm met with Glenn Davies and APB (Office of Academic Planning & Budget). There we finally learned the size of our mid-year cut in the Library: 2%. Since it is relatively small, it is to be taken across-the-board. That 2% is to become a permanent reduction next year. The strategy of how to achieve the 2% in the current year can be different from how we do it next year.

[After the meeting ExComm determined that we'd take 2% out of the materials budget and 1.7% out of each of our unit budgets. Our department's share is about \$37K and we have so many empty positions at present we could cover it all with lapsed salaries if we had to.]

The campus budget is going to shrink an additional 5% next fiscal (so, 7% overall). That cut will be administered "strategically." So, Library's share could be different, and it might vary across units.

There will be a de facto 8% cut in materials, aside from this, due to a flat budget--no increase to cover the expected 8% increase in subscription costs next fiscal year.

It appears uncertain we would be able to obtain special one-time funding to help with purchase of the new ILS (\$1.8-2M). In the discussion afterwards, one idea put forward was obtaining corporate sponsorship of the new online system.

CUE & AFT negotiations currently underway might end up requiring more funds, whose source is as yet unknown.

The SRLF will be full by the middle of this decade, and the earliest a ballot initiative might appear to fund expansion is 2009.

VERIP is unlikely, since an institution would need to have 2 really bad years in a row. Voluntary TRIPs are not seen as garnering large amounts of savings. What might be done to cope? Holding positions open for now. Also, we might have to think about reassignments, outsourcing, temporary appointments.

B. The Draft Budget Principles are to be revised with any revisions forthcoming from AdCon by the end of this week. That document is expected to go out to all staff next week some time.

C. OTNG Update. Terry strongly urges the collection of faculty input. Web forms are going to be put up. A special kiosk will be set up on north campus to give faculty and students a chance to look at the systems in use at other campuses and to comment.

D. LAO reception policy. Serving as receptionist now is a set of 4 students. If you have an appointment with a member of ExComm, you should stop and "check in," so they can see if the person is there and let them know you are coming in.

E. Groupware Implementation Team's update on E-mail.

The also-rans:

MS-Outlook is a security risk

Mozilla is new, but is not TEAMS compatible

Pegasus is hard to distribute and has no support for Library address books

Eudora has a Simeon-like look & feel but is not good with address books

GIT is recommending Mulberry as an email client, since it offers powerful options, the system support is good, and staff address books are supported. WebMail, the other option we will have, permits forwarding to off campus addresses when you're not at UCLA (unlike Simeon) and will mean you won't have to use Pine when you're on the road.

AdCon members were invited to switchover to WebMail now if they wanted, provided they have machines with 1/3 Gig of RAM (too slow otherwise), are willing to build their address books over again, don't deal too much with attachments (work arounds needed), and realize they cannot go back to Simeon.

WebMail can be learned on the "buddy" system. Mulberry will definitely require training to understand and use all the features. John asked that a Tech Talk be used to preview people on what it will be like to use the tools.

The SunOne calendar system is also coming our way.

II. U of Wash trip to learn about e-resources workflow – Valerie Bross

[A detailed report follows these minutes.]

III. Infomine potential collaboration update – John Riemer

SCAER has been discussing the impact of trying to migrate the rest of the e-resources from Taos that have not already migrated. So far, only serials have come over to ERDb. That leaves the monographs. Right now there appear to be 3K monos that are not gov docs and 8K monos that are gov docs. Two-thirds of the non-gov doc monographs have call#s we can use for subject term mapping; with the gov doc monographs, the ratio is the reverse: 2/3's lack call#s.

SCAER has been talking with RIS about possibly taking over responsibility for ERDb editing for the gov docs, but that would mean they would face clean up of 6K records that would come over without any subject headings.

In discussions with Infomine people at UCR, we learned that a strong point of their database is inclusion of the federal document records for which UCR has gotten Marcive records. Infomine records for federal gov docs thus have LCSH. Not sure how many have call#s, but probably more than 1/3.

That led SCAER to ask RIS how they would feel about RIS using Infomine for input of local gov doc resources that are not already present and then trying to extract the gov doc subset of Infomine for loading into ERDb. That had great appeal to them.

John asked about the role of selection and got the sense that for gov docs, RIS (and other UCs) might be willing to accept a standard set of records.

Mapping to our set of 80 local subject headings will depend on how prevalent call#s are in those records. JR is not sure how else mapping can be done. The local subject vocabulary may have to be sacrificed for these resources.

What about the correspondence of the gov doc records to our catalog? Right now we think in terms of 2 databases, Orion & ERDb, and of how we can synchronize them. If we used Infomine to support the public discovery of E-resources, leaving licensing metadata in the ERDb, then we would have 3 databases to think about synchronizing: Orion, ERDb, Infomine. Some on SCAER think we wouldn't need to put all the gov docs into Orion, but instead could rely on federated searching across multiple databases to achieve one-stop shopping.

In a phone call meeting with UCR yesterday, John asked about both the email notification capability being created for Infomine (so catalogers could be notified) and about a "sponsoring unit" field so that selectors here could point dynamic searches against the contents of Infomine. Initial reaction was that they would be willing to develop these.

The 3 types of collaboration we can think about between UCLA & UCR appear to be the data, the software, and the people doing the editing.

## Handouts:

Article: "University of Washington Libraries Digital Registry," Kathleen Forsythe, Steve Shadle. In Journal of Internet Cataloging, v. 4: no. 4 (2002): pp. 51-65.

Linking in the Library Catalog : Recommendations from the Cataloging Policy Committee (<http://staffweb.lib.washington.edu/cpc/linkrecs.html>)

E-Resource Management in Millennium (pages from Innovative presentation)

Sample screen from Affilia bibliographic and checkin records

## Web sites:

<http://www.lib.wash.edu/asp/registry/classranges.asp>

- I. Serials Acquisitions & Serials Cataloging Workflow: Meeting with: Brenda Catlett (Serials Acquisitions Library Specialist I); Kathleen Forsythe (Electronic Resources Cataloging Librarian, Monographic Services); Steve Shadle (Serials Cataloging); Laurie Sutherland (Head, Serials Acquisitions); Jim Stickman (Head, Serials Services)
- [Note: This outline also includes some information shared by Steve Shadle & Brenda Catlett in a follow-up session at the end of the day.]*

## A. Overview of e-resource acquisitions:

1. Licensed: Tim Jewell/Diane Grover work with selectors → license → notify Brenda Catlett (Serials Acquisitions) who receives or determines the list of titles included by the license; searches UW catalog & OCLC → Brenda enters information record in brief bib record & check in record. The check-in record includes: contacts, titles (if short list) or URL for web site → Bib record generates DR record → Brenda notifies Steve Shadle or Kathleen Forsythe of web site to catalog
  - a. Note: Diane Grover works with Steve Shadle/Brenda Catlett to determine form of issuance, level of cataloging (package or specific e-resource)
  - b. All licensed resources are cataloged at some level
2. Digital initiative e-resources (produced in conjunction with library): Package-level records are entered in the Digital Registry, Catalog. Item-level metadata are entered in separate databases that have federated searching
3. "Comes on" titles: Brenda determines online availability at time of order (or, for existing titles, from publisher notification in ejournal email file); adds 856 & checkin record for URL → Digital registry record
4. Freely-available cataloged items: Selectors enter information in online form → emails Serials Acquisitions → Brief cataloging record which is used to generate Digital registry record → notifies Steve Shadle or Kathleen Forsythe of web site to catalog
5. Freely-available uncataloged items: Selectors enter links directly into the web pages using the authoring tool; do not enter information in Digital Registry. Example: The Government Documents librarian does participate in the digital registry. Since the library has a contract for Marcive records, federal documents are fairly well covered; but other documents are cataloged only if requested by another subject specialist (e.g., fisheries documents)

## B. Development of model: 1996/97: UW looked at Columbia's Central Digital Store.

Columbia used the catalog to spin information from the bib record to the Digital Store.

The DS was used to auto-generate pages. UW decisions:

1. Location: UW decided to use one location code for all e-resources, rather than assigning e-resource codes for each collection.
2. Existing pages: UW decided that all entries on the existing web pages were to be considered "selected" for the original conversion. (Since then, selectors have option of deciding which e-resources are cataloged & which are separately-maintained through the selector pages). Now, 1/3 of the selectors accept complete auto-generation; 1/3 of the selectors use partial auto-generation for their pages.

3. Autogeneration: The digital registry is used to generate three segments of the library gateway: e-journals; databases; selector pages.
  4. Selected sites: Goal: From catalog to DR in 24 hours:
    - a. Free (web sites, mainly): Online form for selectors → brief record in Catalog → DR record → regenerated page
    - b. Licensed: CMS license → Acquisitions (brief bib → DR) → Cataloging
  5. Mapping records from the catalog to the Digital Registry:
    - a. Protected fields that are used by the DR: Within the catalog, the following fields are protected (not overwritten by incoming OCLC records): 099, 249 (alternate titles, including continues/continued by), 856, 590, 690
    - b. Classification: Subject categories in the Library Gateway are generated by mapping (1) Class numbers (within ranges) and (2) 043 area codes to the Digital registry. The Class numbers are taken from 050, 060, 090, 099 fields. Multiple 099 fields are used to force the appearance of resources on the pages for certain selectors. LC class numbers have also been rigged up for special areas (e.g., GN0 to represent the range of GN). There are about 300 class ranges; refinement is an on-going process. Class numbers are not required for everything. In retrospect, fund codes might have been a better approach.
    - c. Titles:
    - d. Genre headings: These are generated from 690 genre headings
- C. Aggregator database records:
1. Three years ago, Mark Kibbey began to acquire record sets from Proquest & Nexis-Lexis. At first, UW obtained the record sets directly; now, UW receives them as part of the Tri-College Consortium. The records have been loaded as part of a separate workflow, with little human intervention.
  2. Load procedure: First, the incoming records are matched by ISSN. Those records matching one record with an ISSN spawn a check-in record attached to an existing bib record in the UW catalog. Those records matching no UW records enter as separate records. (This category includes incoming records that lack ISSN.) Third, incoming records matching multiple UW records are sidelined & reported out for human resolution.
  3. Future: UW is working with Serials Solutions. In the future, Serials Solutions should provide records that can be matched with existing UW records to create more detailed checkin records with holdings information. The problem is that one of the SS services is bib records. But the bib records have a single 856 with multiple subfield \$u URLs. How can this be used to spawn useful check-in records?
- D. Web Bridge: Serials Solutions also provides the information needed for Web Bridge (which is Ill's equivalent of SFX). In this service, SS provides separate holdings records for each package. So, unlike the bib record problem, the holdings records service can map to separate WebBridge entries. The issue with WebBridge is to format holdings information in a useful way. Also, so far, the SS service only provides access to ejournals.
- E. Silver-linker replacement: UW also has a separate service from SilverPlatter, to provide integrated access to all SilverPlatter products. But UW is not a "SilverPlatter Shop" so this service provides very limited benefits. UW hopes to replace Silver-linker with Serials Solutions.
- F. Level of analysis: Aside from Proquest and Nexis-Lexis, most database aggregator packages are entered at the package level. Three considerations govern the decision of whether to analyze: (1) stability of individual titles within a package; (2) lack of title-level identity; (3) workload. For example, Psych articles is stable, but there is no title-level identity to journals. Accessible archives (a Civil War package) is also stable; whether to

enter some individual e-resource records is under discussion.

- G. Government documents: Government Publications do their own work on class mappings to the Digital Registry.
- H. Maintenance:
  - 1. EMAIL: At the heart of the maintenance effort is a shared mailbox: [ejournal@library.uw.edu](mailto:ejournal@library.uw.edu) . All reports from publishers, error messages from public services librarians, user reports, and staff e-resource problem reports are sent to this shared mailbox where they are reviewed & redistributed. The Serials Cataloging copy cataloger, for example, if she processes a title change for a print serial & discovers URL info on the piece, will send in a form for follow-up by the Acquisitions staff.
  - 2. Time & staffing: 4 serials acquisitions specialists spend 70% of their time on establishing access & trouble-shooting access problems.
  - 3. Link validation: PURLs: Steve Shadle & Adam Schiff process the PURL lists
  - 4. Link validation: non-PURL links: the Digital Registry has a primitive validation tool. Each day, the DR runs the validator; if over a 3-day period the validation fails, the URL is copied to an error report. But the report does not cover redirection. Result: 1-2 ejournal URL errors per week; 3-4 monograph URLs per week. Serials Acquisitions handles these error reports. She adds a note to the checkin record about temporary lack of availability on a record-by-record basis. For package-wide problems, the systems people post a general message.
  - 5. Package-wide changes: Codes in the checkin records allow Serials to pull out sets of records by aggregator or publisher.
  - 6. Re-loading records in the DR: Each time a bib, holdings, or checkin record is edited in the catalog, a copy is sent to the report file. This file is run against the DR to add new records, update existing records, or delete records from the DR. The DR could be manually edited by the systems folks, in case of emergency. In practice, manual intervention in the registry almost never happens. Instead, corrected records are pulled in overnight into the DR; then the DR is used to regenerate selector pages.
- I. Multiple URLs for same coverage: Only 1 URL is used for full-text coverage of the same range of volumes. According to Brenda, EBSCOHost is least desirable; but if it is available first, then she will put in a temporary record for the EBSCOHost URL. Later, when the Ingenta link is set up, she will suppress the EBSCOHost checkin record & activate a new checkin record for the Ingenta link.
- J. Organizational infrastructure:
  - 1. E-Journal Group
  - 2. Collection Development Managers' Group (Tim Jewell, chair)
  - 3. Informal Groups: Jim Stickman sees as one of his responsibilities to bring together people who can speak knowledgeably on certain issues, to informally resolve problems.
- II. E-Monographs & non-MARC Metadata: Meeting with: Joe Kiegel (Head, Monographs Division: [kiegel@u.washington.edu](mailto:kiegel@u.washington.edu))
  - A. Digital Registry Process for monographs: Selectors use a web form to send a message to the shared email box → staff enter a brief record in the III catalog → record is printed out and distributed to catalogers → catalogers replace record (except for protected fields) with full record.
  - B. Single v. Separate record:
    - 1. UW uses the single record approach for monographs. Catalogers can exercise judgment on whether a new record is needed, if the e-monograph is not a true version of the print. So far, almost all of the e-books have been versions of existing print. Spec Coll did order one ebook, not realizing what it was; but then retracted the

order. Since then, the few online-only orders have been converted to print or print + online.

2. Selector reaction: Selectors have been practical
- C. Vendor records:
1. netLibrary: UW purchased access, rather than leasing for a year. The records were added with 925 field to identify the set number: **925 set: [3-digit no.]**
  2. IEEE Xplore: This package is still under discussion because it includes many conference pubs, some of which have been cataloged as serials by UW. OCLC has a record set, but all items are done as monographs.
  3. Safari: Smaller sets, like Safari are handled by title-by-title cataloging, rather than mass load of record sets. National Academy Press is another small set; this title is problematic since it was originally freely-available, now will be changing. So, for now, UW is representing each e-resource item with a generic link.
- D. Policy on copycataloging: Copy catalogers check to make sure the link is valid, but accept all links. So, if some links are for TOC, they are accepted. (Copycataloging at UW has two levels: (1) rapid cat; and (2) copy cataloging (more complex editing). Recently, the Cataloging Policy Committee had a long discussion about types of links & made a recommendation to library administration. The recommendation concerns not only links to closely related sites (TOCs, summary/abstracts) but also to other types of links—such as to an organization related to a document; or to a faculty web page, from the faculty publication. Use of authority records for links to organizations would not work in the III system because the current representation of authority records in the OPAC is only for x-refs.
- E. Staff involvement with MARC cataloging of e-resources: At this point, most of the original catalogers have been trained & some copy catalogers. The problem is with the amount of incoming cataloging requests—unless there are sufficient requests, people won't gain experience. Eventually, everyone will be involved in cataloging e-resources.
- F. Staff involvement with non-MARC cataloging of e-resources:
1. Several years ago, the Cataloging Dept established a Metadata Implementation Group to look at non-MARC (DC) fields for Digital Initiatives. The Group consists of librarians and classified staff; it provides advice to those working on digital projects in the library or in conjunction with the library (i.e., faculty). As a result of the work of the MIG, projects are defined to support both the special needs of the items (e.g., image collections) and to support cross-project (“federated”) searching.
  2. Thesauri: The MIG uses existing thesauri wherever possible. In general, LCSH is used; with specialized thesauri like AAT when appropriate.
  3. Staffing: 2 FTE to catalog for special projects. One LA1 has been trained to assign LCSH. Now, UW is looking at a grant project and the 2 FTE will not be enough. The 2 FTE came out of Acquisitions, which had freed up staff due to streamlined procedures. In the future, who does record entry may need reconsideration—it's a workload issue. The Digital Initiatives work, for example, is not steady—it's up & down. Sometimes the 2 FTE work on a project, sometimes on other cataloging.
- III. Meeting with: Diane Grover (Electronic Collections Coordinator); Tim Jewell (Head, Collection Management Services); Mark Kibbey (Associate Director for Resources and Collection Management Services); Laurie Sutherland; Jim Stickman (Head)
- A. Goal: To leverage the present investment in the cataloging records & Digital Registry. But III is not a relational database.
- B. Resource records: Each record has a max of 15 variable fields & 15 fixed fields. Some data to be coded: activation dates, restrictions on use, which campus has access to the

e-resources.

- C. Evaluation of catalog v. digital registry: At present, there is more sustained interest in the catalog rather than the registry. That's due in part to access issues (proxy service).
  - D. Trouble-shooting: Several scenarios are being considered. Two are: trouble reports; a billboard list.
  - E. Access to redacted license: Tim suggested two possibilities: (1) a scanned, redacted license; or (2) a schematic version based on info drawn from the license record.
- IV. Follow-up meeting with Steve Shadle & Brenda
- A. Access to types of URLs:
    - 1. Passworded: Bill Jordan scripts access
    - 2. Proxy server
    - 3. Registration required: Currently, Brenda lets these go through. In some cases, she has added a note to 856 \$z about registration.
  - B. For more information on the digital registry, check the NASIG site—Steve did a presentation in Pittsburgh on it: “Putting It All Together: the Involvement of Technical Services, Public Services and Systems to Create a Web-Based Resource Collection.”  
<http://zeeb.library.cmu.edu/Conferences/NASIG/Workshops2.html#WS19> or  
<http://nasig.org/proceedings/1999/workshop19.html>
  - C. Classification ranges table: 3-4 people have permission to edit this table, as the 043s change or as selectors need ranges refined.
  - D. Notes:
    - 1. Temporary: Brenda adds a “Temporarily unavailable” note to the checkin record; the Digital Registry is then updated overnight.
    - 2. 520 notes: Very few ejournals have 520 notes; but the IRs do.
    - 3. Continues/continued by: Since the DR lacks linking fields, UW has been entering this information in 249 fields (so that a title search will turn up the earlier/later records)
  - E. Disappearing sites: UW has a procedure for broken links. Since contact info is available in the checkin record, selector contact is built into the process. The workflow is: access problem → (reported to) [ejournal@library.uw.edu](mailto:ejournal@library.uw.edu) → investigated by Brenda & her assistants. If the link is dead and the item is freely-available, a message is sent to the catalogers, to withdraw the record. The selector is also notified. If the link is dead & the item is part of a licensed package, a message is sent to Acquisitions for follow-up.
  - F. Digital Registry scope: The DR was set up to accept non-MARC records, so technically, the Digital Initiative records could go into the DR. But by policy, the Digital Initiative projects are represented in the DR at the package level.