

Agenda notes for April 9, 2010 MCDAC meeting

- A. In regards to the indexing of the second indicators of the 655 field, the following information (sent in an e-mail to MCDAC previously) needs to be discussed. MCO has talked with III about the process to make these changes and it appears to be a potentially lengthy and/or labor-intensive endeavor. In order for the second indicators of 0, 1, and 2 to appear in the INN-Reach catalog, each record needs to be resent to INN-Reach in order for the changes to the mapping table to take effect. There are two ways that records can be sent to INN-Reach. First, records are sent to INN-Reach through normal workflow and eventually all records will be adjusted. This process can take a long time (potentially years according to MCO) and will mean that not every record will appear consistently the same in the catalog until all records have been resent. Second, MCO can purposefully resend all the records to INN-Reach. They can do this during off-peak hours, but it will take quite a bit of time and staff effort (I don't have an estimate of the time required, but can inquire if necessary.). Thus, in light of this information, we have a few decisions to make.
1. Do we want to let the normal workflow change the records or purposefully resend them all at once?
 2. If it would be preferable to purposefully resend records for a consistent display, given the workload to MCO do we still want to add the second indicators 0, 1, and 2 of the 655 field? This question is seeking to gauge the priority of this change to the committee.
 3. If we still want to resend and do so purposefully, are there any other changes we wish to make to the INN-Reach indexing rules while MCO is making changes anyway? I have spoken with the Task Force on WebPac Design and Maintenance and they had no other recommendations of changes to the indexing rules.
- B. A few items that have come in regarding the new redesign:
1. It appears that the link in the INN-Reach catalog for 'CLICK HERE to view additional volumes at <CLUSTER NAME>' is not working. MCO is aware of the problem and working on it.
 2. Suggestion to change the examples on the main search page from 'Italian cooking' and 'The Appeal' to demonstrate more in-depth search strategies.
 3. Suggestion to include search examples on the 'Journal Title' search screen which do not include the word 'and' – to avoid confusion between titles and Boolean operators.
 4. Suggestion to add a link/button on the 'Advanced Keyword Search' near the top of the screen to the search tips at the bottom of the page. At the moment, scrolling is required to see the tips.
 5. Suggestion to have the 'Before' and 'After' boxes of the 'Year of Publication' limit of the Advanced Keyword Search appear on the same line.
- C. In regards to the call number search in the INN-Reach catalog, there are a few concerns. In INN-Reach, the 050 and 090 field of the bibliographic record appears in the LC call number index. In most cluster catalogs, the call number in the item record is what appears in this index. Thus, there is some confusion as to why the indexes are different and exactly which call number is preferable to be in the index for INN-Reach. And if the same indexing rules that are in place now are to be kept, should the catalog make a note or more clearly reflect where the call number is coming from?