

Catalogers Group Minutes

March 6, 2003

Present: Gia Aivazian, Sharon Benamou, Valerie Bross, Joan LoPear, Janice Matthiesen, Luiz Mendes, Caroline Miller (recorder), Jeff Morehead, Nancy Norris, Hao Phan, Paul Priebe, Louise Ratliff, John Riemer, Angela Riggio, Rita Stumps

John led a discussion to find out what people thought after attending the latest round of vendor demos.

Cataloging Clients

Although all three systems offer global change capability, the members of the Authority Section “utterly reject” one of them with regard to authority control. The subject authority staff were impressed with the ability of another system because of ability to suppress blind references in the OPAC. This type of blind reference suppression could pose a problem for music materials because of the need to view uniform titles. Only one of the systems allows the public to see the entire authority record. A couple of the systems seem to be on the verge of new systems and another had much further to go. Advantage was seen in selecting a system in use elsewhere in the state or at the national libraries. The different standing of the various systems in regard to Unicode implementation was noted; some of that may be due to the influence of the customer base for each system.

Would the price of the system ultimately determine which one we get, due to difficult budget times? The idea of corporate sponsorship of the new system had arisen in AdCon. The mouse-click intensiveness of one system was pointed out. Compatibility of a system with macro usage is important, and we should collaborate with other institutions with the same system wherever possible by sharing macros. The systems have implemented the MARC21 holdings format to varying degrees. One system presents a significant training issue due to a non-standard meanings of “volume” and “copy.” Another appears to make unorthodox use of 773 fields. If we signed on with a highly non-standard system, would we jeopardize our ability ever to migrate to something else in the future?

One system does not even offer the copy and paste function! The demo script question on analytics went unanswered by one vendor. Tiling multiple open windows is tedious but is preferable to only being able to open one window at a time.

Music library colleagues have gravitated to one of the systems in recent times; we need to find out how the complicated music uniform titles work in that system. As for shelflisting functions, a couple of the systems appear to have a limited display in the cataloging client; the OPAC might have to be used instead. None of the systems have “keyword-in-heading” searching, which is important for subject authority control. Perhaps, there are ways around this, through the generation of reports. The delayed progress of MELVYL-T is alarming, if that implementation is just a union catalog, and

not a full implementation of all modules of an ILS. It was noted that the original MELVYL was able to structure records in a way that is just not done in any vendor's product (i.e. the preservation of the campus-specific view of any field that differed from other campuses' editing. The response time was notably faster among some of the systems we saw. A couple of systems can index anything in the record, including 856 and 653 fields, which is a nice feature; the ability to search in "keyword anywhere" fashion can compensate for not having thought to index a given field in a special way from the outset.

OPACs and Portals

Members hoped that our current indexes will be able to conform to the new system. The vendors were supposed to show a record with numerous holdings and locations (the periodical *Science*), but not all demos complied. One vendor neglected to show any record featuring a diacritic, so we were unable to view how those displayed.

Two of the systems showed no sign of interest in developing capability for handling digital licensing metadata, as Innovative is attempting to do.

In summation, John asked the group whether it felt that two of the systems are still far superior to the third. The consensus was a strong Yes. John pointed out that workflows might change once we get a new system, such that OCLC records would be downloaded in the Acquisitions Department and subsequently cataloged in the local system.

John reminded the group to please send in comments to the OTNG comments site: <http://unitproj.library.ucla.edu/lis/otng/eval.cfm>

Announcements

John said that a possible meeting time for March would be on March 27 to hear a report on the recent Music Library Association conference. Our next meeting will most likely be on March 20 to continue our discussion of CSB #97. It will be in West Electronic Classroom.