

Arthur Technical Services Committee – 22 July 2008

Present: Tom Schultz (William Woods), Inas El-Sayed (Lincoln), Corrie Hutchinson (Stephens), Vandy Evermon (Columbia), Susan Morrisroe (State Library), Corinne Caputo (Westminster).

The meeting convened at 9:30 a.m. in room 118 at the MCO office. Corrie and Corinne were slightly delayed by inclement weather. Tom Schultz opened the meeting by addressing the 2nd agenda item, display of diacritics in the catalog. It had been noted several months ago, that diacritical marks in foreign titles were not displaying properly in the public catalog. Tom S. opened a call with the Mobius office. It was found that the problem was caused by an improper setting in the wwwoptions file. Once the setting had been corrected, the diacritics displayed correctly. Tom also noted that, while in millennium cataloging, you should set your character map to Marc-8 plus, as it contains all the necessary characters.

Tom asked if Corrie Hutchinson would elaborate on the process she has used to prepare and distribute the quarterly Mars authority reports, since MCO no longer performs this function. Corrie said that there have been some changes from Word files to web files, which affects how the records display, and which has caused her to change her formatting procedures. She stated that she has to play with the files a bit in order to get them into a format where they can be evenly distributed among the member libraries, e.g., transferring web files to Word documents which can be displayed as a single item per page. Corrie said that she is happy to continue doing these files now that she has her procedures down. Tom S. thanked her, and said that the process is one that we should all at least be familiar with. Corrie agreed to process the latest quarterly reports. Some further discussion ensued about the authority reports, with several members noting that the information in the reports seems to have varied over time. Tom S. noted that the last reports he received apparently tried to index the title fields of some contents notes through the title authority list, with no success. He noted that this had never occurred before. Susan Morrisroe wondered if other clusters had experienced these changes and if they had had any discussion which might be useful to us.

Corrie and Inas both noted that the large name authority report which any of us might receive after a quarterly processing contained a large number of name authorities which do not correspond to anything in the Arthur catalog. Why were these headings added if no holdings exist? The committee asked Tom, as chair, to contact MCO and see if these records were somehow loaded in error. Is it possible that another cluster's name authorities were inadvertently added to Arthur?

Serials record duplication – There appear to be a great many serial title duplications in the Arthur catalog. Corinne created a list and brought some examples to share with the committee. On a side note, there are still a number of serials with large numbers of items whose item records have not been suppressed. This creates an ongoing display problem in the catalog. Members reiterated that if one of us comes across these records, we should contact the owning library and ask that the records be suppressed and a holdings statement be added for display. This has been policy for a long time, but it has been unevenly implemented. In looking at the examples of *Current biography* and *Current biography yearbook* Susan Morrisroe noted that one member's item records were attached to the incorrect bib record. *Current biography* is a closed record, and yet some item records for *Current biography yearbook* had been attached. We all agreed that correcting deficiencies in the catalog is a long term, ongoing project, and that we would all make needful corrections to our own catalog records as we find them, or are made aware of them. Our union catalog contains many very old records created under different rules, and sometimes by people with insufficient training and resources.

Corinne wondered about the suppressed bibs in the catalog. If you find a suppressed bib, and you have acquired the material, is it OK to unsuppress and use that bib record? Corrie stated that she would have no problems using a suppressed bib record, provided she checked with the original library. At any rate, suppressed bib records are of no concern to the patrons, since they do not appear in the public catalog. There was more discussion on what constitutes a duplicate record. Susan reminded us that there is a policy for dealing with duplicates in the Arthur documents on the MCO homepage. Using the example of *Reader's guide* Susan showed examples that might appear to be duplicates, but aren't.

Vandy noted that in the past, if we found a record that we thought had a problem, we passed our concerns along to the appropriate catalog librarian, and left it to their discretion as to correcting the record or respond to the e-mail. We all agreed that this strategy has worked well for us, and that should continue with it.

As regards cluster communication, Corinne stated that she had felt a great deal of frustration with the Arthur listserv, that people were unresponsive and uncommunicative, unless they were asked a specific question, and given a deadline by which they needed to respond. Other committee members said that they responded if it was necessary to do so, and that the listserv archive would show this. Tom noted that perhaps it might be possible to make more active use of the listserv than we have done in the past. Susan reminded us that we needed to be specific in our subject lines about who the messages are intended for, coordinators, tech services, etc. The subject line is the only way to let committee members know if a message is specific to their committee. Tom asked for clarification if all the Tech services members were on the Coordinators' listserv, and was informed that they are. In response to this discussion, Inas noted that as librarians, we are all probably subscribed to numerous professional lists and that the bulk of daily e-mail can be overwhelming. An immediate failure to respond should not be construed as being dismissive of the author or the message, but simply as the result of prioritizing. If she gets an e-mail that requires a response, it will get a response.

The ongoing discussion about hanging bibs was continued – how do we deal with suppressed bib records that have no other records attached? As previously stated, our policy has always been to contact that library, and make them aware of the hanging record. Susan M. noted that the Missouri State Library has upwards of 50,000 hanging bibs which are suppressed, largely for old Fed Docs and defunct serials no longer held. She wondered if someone else unsuppressed a record and added holdings, how that would affect MOSL's holding symbol on the record. The response was that if they had no holdings, no location or call number connected to them would appear in the public display, only the actual holdings would appear. The committee agreed that the best course would be contact the library that suppressed the record and check to see if it is alright to use the record.

Tom asked if there were any committee updates. Corrie gave an update from the MCDAC committee. She reminded us that Library of Congress is now only supporting 490/830 combinations as series statements and wondered if we had set up our profiles accordingly. We noted that Christopher Gould had sent word about this quite awhile ago, and that we had voted for the compatible option during our processing.

There being no other updates or reports, we agreed not to schedule our next meeting separately, but to meet in tandem with the coordinators. We will schedule an afternoon meeting following their regular morning meeting. The meeting was then adjourned.

Tom R. Schultz,
Chair, Arthur Technical Services Committee