

SWAN Cluster Cataloging Committee minutes, June 20, 2000, 10:00 a.m.-noon, Drury

Present: Barbara Schade (Crowder), Phyllis Holzenberg (Drury), Linda Henderson (MSSC), Susan Huston (MSSC), Gwen Gilpin (OTC), Coleen Rose (SBU), Karen Letarte (SMSU), Michelle Turvey (SMSU), Rose Scarlet (SMSU-WP).

Power Point Presentations from IUG (Innovative Users Group) meeting, 2000

(<http://innopacusers.org/faqs/index.html#III>)

Contains information on new products as well as a presentation on getting the most out of the III User's Manual with step-by-step online tutorial. The site requires a user name and password that may be obtained from your site coordinator.

Discussion began on Robin's reply on BNA and tagging Icode2 in order to determine which records received TOCs. According to Robin, Icode2 may only contain one value determining whether or not a record displays. Robin suggested the use of a formatted internal note (e.g. |x 505 needed) in the item record. The exact wording of the note within the cluster was discussed and the form agreed upon. The SWAN cluster will use the following internal note in lower-case letters:

|x toc

Clarification was requested on how often records would be sent to BNA for TOC enhancements. Karen stated it was her understanding that one month of records would be sent to BNA at a time after the initial database has been sent. Everyone was reminded to add enhanced 505s for pre-1995 imprints if possible.

Initial database cleanup (importance in descending order)

1. Adjusting any icodes and status fields

OTC will be redone due to initial load problems with call numbers and the 985 field.

2. Checking database to confirm the correct mapping for location codes

The two above items are needed because they affect institutional circulation and loan periods.

3. Resolving duplicate records

The cluster will need to check with Robin in order to determine how the gap work will load. Will it load in the same order as the initial database load? Will records overlay in the same manner?

Coleen mentioned an interest in videotaping the additional circulation training sessions to be given by Mark Wahrenbrock of the MOBIUS office. Other committee members raised concerns over whether or not this kind of taping of proprietary software would be allowed. As for possible training sites for the additional circulation training, Phyllis suggested inquiring about the Drury Tech Hall and the information was forwarded to David Adams of SMSU. Barbara mentioned that Crowder might have lab space if folks did not mind driving. Next week's circulation training will be held Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 8:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m. at OTC with III trainer Michael Burton.

Questions were raised about the status of the SWAN webpac. Committee members expressed interest on seeing the final SWAN logo again. Coleen indicated that she could re-send a copy of the logo to the discussion list.

Cathy Stubbs will stop loading SWAN records Thursday and Friday of this week in order for SMSU to conduct its cataloging training.

Linda mentioned attending the serials training. It was suggested that the serials check-in boxes be used for monographic serials.

MERLIN standards and merging records

For the MERLIN standards themselves, please see http://merlin.missouri.edu/lso/standard/mqcc_standards.htm

The bulk of the meeting time was spent focusing on MERLIN monographic standards and various adaptations for the SWAN cluster. It was suggested that the committee use a less complicated numbering scheme within the document.

3.1.1.1. Monograph records with the same OCLC number

(In field 001 or 019) May be merged without consulting other cataloging center(s).

It was hoped that the initial load prevented this. Members agreed on the wording as found in the MERLIN document. Members were also reminded to carefully compare each of the records before merging in order to make sure additions (e.g. contents notes, etc.) are retained.

3.1.1.2 Monographs records without an OCLC number may be merged as follows:

3.1.1.2.1. Approval vendor records may be merged if they have the same title and LC card number.

N/A in SWAN cluster

3.1.1.2.2. Brief records (including brief approval vendor records) having the **same title as an OCLC record** may be merged.

It was suggested that a minimum standard for brief records within the cluster be created. The minimum standard elements are as follows: title, other title, statement of responsibility, edition (if known), imprint, standard number (LCCN, ISBN, ISSN). It was also agreed that these brief records should be input in ALL CAPS. Barbara stated that it was ok to overlay minimal records in the paperback collection at Crowder with fuller OCLC records if the provisional record and the OCLC record match. Karen mentioned that Robin had sent an email to the discussion list with a detailed explanation on how to force a record to overlay.

3.1.1.2.3. Brief records having a **variant title from the OCLC** record, but with all other information the same should be merged only with extreme caution, particularly if an open order record is attached.

The cluster agreed to let the originating library fix the brief record with the variant title from the OCLC record at the time of cataloging. One should also notify the library via phone or email if the items appear to be the same. This policy differs from the above MERLIN policy.

3.1.1.2.4. Non-OCLC retrospective conversion records (e.g., MU Utlas records) may be merged with the OCLC record for the same title and edition in MERLIN, without consulting the cataloging center with holdings on the non-OCLC record.

The cluster agreed that it is ok to merge a non-OCLC record with an OCLC record, however, the library whose record is being merged will need to have their holdings added to OCLC. In this situation, the library who is merging the record needs to adjust the icode so the other library's holdings will be added to OCLC rather than notifying the library of the need to add their own holdings.

3.1.1.3. Multiple Records, Different OCLC Numbers.

3.1.1.4. Multiple Records, for the same work, with different OCLC numbers, may be merged without consulting the other cataloging center(s).

The cluster agreed that the merging of multiple records with different OCLC numbers is ok, however, the merging institution should notify the original institution for holdings purposes.

3.1.1.4. Multiple Records, Different Treatment.

If multiple records appear to be for the same work but have different treatment (e.g., multipart item vs. bibliographic record for each volume), retain all bibliographic records or consult the holding library(ies) before resolving.

Here one should consult the other library. III allows for the use of the same barcode on two different records. Series

tracing decisions should be noted in the series authority records (e.g. |5 MOU). Karen stated that she is willing to provide extra training on this if there is interest.

3.1.1.5. Before the Transfer of Holdings Takes Place:

Take the following related elements into consideration.

3.1.1.5.1. Retain all **indexed fields** (e.g., 650 2, 970, 019, etc.).

3.1.1.5.2. Retain **local data** (e.g., 590, 690).

SWAN will create a list of indexed fields and local data so libraries know exactly what should be retained. Coleen stated that any SBU barcodes found in field 590 may be deleted without consultation. Rose asked whether or not one should leave Sears subject headings in records. Karen responded it is okay to leave the Sears subject headings in a record, as they will be added to the keyword indexes. Only 650 0 will be contained in the subject index. Relator codes (e.g. |e ill., etc.) will not be loaded into the database. Any |e added after the initial load will not display.

The date for the next SWAN Cataloging Committee meeting was set for July 5, 9:30 a.m., Drury University. The meeting will focus on standards for serials cataloging.

Minutes submitted by M. Turvey