

## Catalogers Group Minutes, March 23, 2006

### Topic: Cataloging Problems

Present: Gia Aivazian, Behzad Allahyar, Melissa Beck, Valerie Bross, Chamyia Kincy (recorder), Sara Shatford Layne, Luiz Mendes, Nancy Norris, Louise Ratliff, John Riemer, Rita Stumps, Kristen Wilson

### Question 1 (from Valerie): *Forum for Health Economics & Policy*: Website or unnumbered series?

The screenshot shows the website for the Forum for Health Economics & Policy. The address bar at the top indicates the URL is <http://www.bepress.com/fhiep/>. The website has a blue header with the 'bepress' logo and navigation links: My Account, All Journals, Contact, About bepress, Subscriptions, Services, and Rate R. The main content area features the journal title 'Forum for Health Economics & Policy' with the subtitle 'An evolving collection of symposia on important health care issues'. Below this, the editors are listed: Alan Garber (Stanford University), Dana Goldman (RAND), and Tomas Philipson (University of Chicago). The website is organized into sections: 'Health Economics' with a link to 'Biomedical Research and the Economy'; 'Health Policy' with a link to 'Medicare Data and Aging'; and 'Frontiers in Health Policy Research' with links to 'Volume 8 (2005)', 'Volume 5 (2002)', 'Volume 4 (2001)', and 'Volume 3 (2000)'. A sidebar on the left contains a 'bepress' logo, the journal title and ISSN (1558-9544), a 'Journal Home Page' menu with links to Aims & Scope, Editorial Board, Policies, and Author Instructions, a 'Submit an Article' button, and a 'Journal Sponsor' section featuring the RAND HEALTH logo.

Publisher considers the title (“Forum for Health Economics & Policy”) to be a peer-reviewed journal but it appears to be something else—either a website or a title that could be established as an unnumbered series. Which option is correct? And on what basis is there differentiation made between an unnumbered series and a website in a case like this?

- Question: Is it an integrating resource? Response: Websites can be either integrating or cumulative. Guidelines have not been established to resolve this issue. Comment: Looseleaves aren’t the only kinds of integrating resources though. This website could be a candidate. Information is not added sequentially to this resource. Counter comment: But the incremental aspects of the information (in the form of articles) are retained, which would make it more of a serial? Counter comment: But there is only one numbered serial within the website. So the item in its entirety wouldn’t be a serial but a website containing a serial.

- (Valerie) How should it be handled: as a top-level website/integrating resource for “Forum for Health Economics?” Or should it be cataloged for the title *Frontiers in Health Policy Research* with a 440 for “Forum for Health Economics & Policy?”
- Comment: Rules and standards aren’t helpful. Rule 21.28 is flawed. There is no consistency established for whole/part relationships. Some have resorted to the use of the 772 or 773 field.

Issue unresolved by the end of the discussion.  
Consensus: Use cataloger’s judgment.

Related question: Would the term “Forum” warrant consideration of this resource as a set of conference proceedings? Answer: Possibly.

**Question 2 (from Kristen): “Archaeological Sites in the Kingdom of Bahrain”:**  
**Should it be handled as a collection level record or set record?** (Examples of pamphlets “Islamic Fortress” passed around.)

Kristen originally thought to do as collection level record but later received advice stating that the items in the collection were bibliographically related, so it should probably be handled as a monographic set.

- Question: Would it have been advisable to do as a collection level record if we don’t know if there will be more archeological sites? Response: There are probably a finite number of physical sites, so in this case it wouldn’t be an issue.
- Question: One might not think to do as a set record because the individual pieces aren’t numbered. How would you set up the 505 field? Response: You would place the numbers in brackets. Follow-up question: But how would you designate the numbering? Response: You would assign the numbers arbitrarily.
- Comment: There is justification for doing this as a set record. There is a common title for all of the pieces. A possible candidate for a collection level record would be a group of items that someone collected from various sources at various times where the only thing in common was the genre. Kristen’s collection has the same publisher, as well as the same title.
- Comment: One negative thing about collection level records is that you wouldn’t be able to add a 505. 505’s are discouraged for collection level records because they would be too long. {This issue was revisited several times for the remainder of the discussion. One person pointed out that BLvl: c *does* allow for a 505. Another person wondered if a 500 field should be used for collection level records in lieu of a 505. A third person pointed out the usefulness of the 505 for bringing out the names of sites that have no established headings. An itemized listing of contents may not be practical if the number of pieces is too numerous; in that case, a contents note could present names of subgroups of material in the collection.}

Kristen gave examples of collection level records in LC’s catalog:  
245 00 [Modern Arabic novels, Egypt, 1].

245 00 [Modern Arabic novels, Egypt, 10].  
245 00 [Modern Arabic novels, Egypt, 11]., etc.

- Comment: Materials that need collection level records generally don't come with titles. They have to have titles applied to them (in brackets). Kristen's collection already has a given title, so it should be done as a set record.
- Comment: Materials grouped together in one or more boxes are good indications for handling as a collection level record.
- Comment: Collection level records might diminish access because you wouldn't be able to do full subject analysis on the individual pieces. Counter comment: Actually, collection level records are more generous in allowing numerous subject headings to fully describe the contents.
- Comment: If the subject matter was a small area of interest, a user might prefer just one record as opposed to 50 different records.

Consensus: Most agree they would handle as a set record.

{After the meeting, Kristen provided links to some guidelines for collection level records}

Princeton's guidelines:

<http://library.princeton.edu/departments/tsd/katmandu/desc/collevel.html>

BIBCO core record standards for collections:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/corecoll.html>

**Question 3 (from Louise): Series authority record for “Edicions La Campana (Series)”: Should a more straightforward cross reference be added to the record?**

Book in hand:

Title: Un català entre bascos

OC: 60831856

MARC field in question: 440 3 La Campana ; #v 249

The number “249” is on the spine with no mention of the series. The series appears alone without the numbering. The authority record establishes the series as “Edicions La Campana (Series)” which is unintuitive for users. Should a cross reference be added to enhance access? Perhaps something like:

430 0 Campana (Series) ???

- Question: Should the definite article be retained? Follow-up question: Is La Campana a corporate heading, and if so, should the definite article still be retained?
- Comment: The term “edition” and its equivalents in Romance languages can be tricky. It could be a false cognate and therefore misleading.

- Question: Could a 410 be added as a reference under the corporate name?  
Response: That would only be done if the corporate body were responsible for the intellectual content. “La Campana” appears only to be the publisher.
- Several point out that the numbering appearing on the spine without the series would indicate only publisher numbering. Counter comment: There are many examples, though, where publications have numbering on the spine (without the series title), but are meant to be taken as series numbering.

Consensus: Add a cross references as follows:  
430 0 Campana (Series) (Barcelona, Spain)

{The qualifier is necessary because there is already a series established under the name of “Campana (Series) (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, Italy).”}

**Follow-up to Question 1 (from Sara): What can be done to minimize the number of ILL requests for websites that are already accessible to the user?**

Suggested solution: Delete CLU’s holdings from OCLC for websites that we’ve cataloged, particularly when they are freely available and there is an obvious link in the catalog record to the website’s URL address. This would reduce the number of unnecessary requests which can get out of hand and can be problematic for ILL staff because it skews statistical reporting on matters like the “fill-rate.”

- Counter comments: In light of the initiatives recently projected in the BSTF report, it might be inadvisable to remove CLU’s holdings from OCLC records because it wouldn’t accurately reveal to users the true extent of our holdings. It also might throw off the ability to receive automatically updated of bibliographic records that others have revised.