

## **BRIDGES CATALOGUING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes**

*January 23, 2003*

The Committee met at Covenant Theological Seminary. Denise Pakala, Committee Chair, presided.

#### **Attending:**

Denise Pakala, Covenant Theological Seminary  
Wendy Schlegel, Eden-Webster Library  
Kathy Nystrom, Eden-Webster Library  
Mary Ann Mercante, Maryville University  
Linda Orzel, Harris-Stowe State College  
June Williams, Fontbonne University  
Marty Knorr, Harris-Stowe State College  
Jean Rose, Logan College of Chiropractic  
Judy Moore, Lindenwood University  
Anne Calhoun, Missouri Baptist University  
Elaine Trost, Missouri Baptist University

#### **Correction to October 22, 2002 Minutes**

Mary Ann pointed out that the heading *INN-Reach Enhancement Proposals* in the Oct. 22 minutes should read *Innopac Enhancement Proposals*. Denise will change this in the minutes on the Bridges cluster website.

#### **Institutional News**

Lindenwood University has hired a new director: Elizabeth McDonald, the former Sanford-Brown library director.

Ann Calhoun has begun work at Missouri Baptist University, cataloging nonbook materials.

#### **MARS Reports**

Denise has received the reports from the last send-out of Bridges records for Authority Control processing. She will distribute them through the Lanter Delivery System. Denise reminded committee members that the Authority Change Reports have only one record per page, so they are good to work on when one wants a feeling of accomplishment.

### **Proposal to Discontinue the Partial Match Report**

The committee discussed MCO's proposal to discontinue the Partial Match Report as a cost-cutting mechanism.

No one objected to the discontinuance of this report. Experience with the Partial Match Report showed it to be helpful only in limited cases, such as Bible headings or William Shakespeare headings. The Committee agreed that it is just as easy to identify these cases and to once or twice a year have someone scan the headings in the catalog to catch problems. Denise will notify Robin to discontinue this report for Bridges.

### **Bridges Item Status Codes**

The Committee reviewed the chart of MOBIUS Status Codes, which compared the displayed meaning in Bridges with the displayed meaning in MOBIUS. The Committee saw no need to modify any of the Bridges status codes.

The New Book Shelf status code of *w* does make these titles Not Requestable in MOBIUS. Denise reported that the MOBIUS Access Advisory Committee has discussed the fact that several clusters use this New Book Shelf status, but that titles in the New Book Shelf status are Not Requestable. Technically, this is a violation of the Memorandum of Understanding signed by MOBIUS members. The Memorandum specifies that new books should be available for MOBIUS lending as soon as they are processed (unless they are non-circulating books). Members of the MOBIUS Access Advisory Committee found no objections to books in a New Book Shelf status being temporarily Not Requestable for the short period of time that they are on the New Book Shelf. Maryville currently uses the status code *w* but their books only stay on the New Book Shelf for 2 weeks.

Denise described how Covenant uses an item location code for items that they put on the New Book Shelf. Covenant also puts a wider range of materials on the New Book Shelf than does Maryville (Covenant puts Reference books and Nonbook materials in addition to Circulating Collection books, while Maryville uses the New Book Shelf for Circulating or Juvenile books only). Covenant also has a different loan period (1 week) for New Book Shelf books. As a result, using a location code for New Book Shelf works better for them. Denise uses an Internal Note to record what the final item location code for the title will be. She also uses a pop-up note for Circulation alerting them that a title (being checked out or checked in) is on the New Book Shelf and needs to be returned to that location.

### **Shared Location Code**

The Committee agreed that the shared item location code should be applied to the Wright American Fiction Project records. The records will not show up in the local catalogs of the institutions currently not part of the shared location code (Logan and Kenrick).

Denise pointed out bib record # b1543204x (*Free Medical Journals*) as another example of a resource for which the share code would be useful. She noted that it appeared possible to set *share* as the bib location. If so, what was the need for an item record? Since none of the Committee could come up with a reason for an item record, Denise will query Gary Harris on the matter.

### **Missouri Documents Records**

With the implementation of the Missouri State Library, there is a possibility that Missouri State Documents records could be loaded into the cluster catalogs or the specific scopes of interested libraries. Maryville has expressed interest. In response to a query as to other interest, Harris-Stowe expressed interest. Maryville will investigate the feasibility and keep Harris-Stowe apprised. If anyone else is interested, they should contact Mary Ann.

### **Local Authority Records**

Kathy Nystrom distributed a draft policy on creating local authority records. She explained that each of us could set up templates for the different types of authority records we might create (name, subject, title, series) She walked us through setting up a template for a name authority record and then creating a local name authority record. This process will create an authority record for the Bridges cluster only. If we think the authority record will be useful for other libraries, we can forward the information to Kathy. She and Wendy have undergone NACO training and can now create national authority records.

The question arose as to whether our local authority records could be zapped by MARS processing. Denise responded that she didn't think so, since matching is done by Authority number. She pointed out that if a national authority record is created for a heading where we have a local authority record and if the national record is returned to Bridges, we would end up with an entry on the Duplicate Authorities report. We could also have an entry on the Duplicate Authorities report if the headings represent different people, but there is not enough identifying information in the headings to distinguish them. When creating a local authority record, we should try, if possible, to find some unique identifying piece of information for the record to prevent an entry on the Duplicate Authorities report.

Denise will seek clarification from MCO as to whether locally created authority records are pulled when records are pulled for MARS processing.

The question of when to use/not use the 690 tag on a local authority record was raised. After discussion, it was decided to use the 690 tag if you are editing an authority record (whether local or LC) but it is not necessary to use it if you are creating it.

The draft local authority records policy was approved as presented by Kathy Nystrom. It will be added to the documents folder of the Bridges Cataloguing Committee webpage on the MCO website.

### **Online Error Reporting Form**

The online error reporting form set up by MCDAC is now in use. Denise reported that she had received the first online error report form on a Bridges record. (The error was a typo in the 245 subfield *a* which she has corrected.) Only the designated contact for each cluster can use the online error reporting form. If we find errors in MOBIUS records which create retrieval problems, email Denise who will determine the owning library or cluster and send an online form to the appropriate cluster contact.

### **Unscoped Bib and Item Records**

At the last Committee meeting, in response to problems arising from the growing number of suppressed records in Bridges, the Committee recommended the use of an Unscoped Bib location rather than bib suppression. Denise has been in conversation with Robin regarding this to check the ramifications for the Union Catalog. Robin does not recommend unscoping bibs. Using unscoped locations without suppression causes the bib to be contributed to the Union Catalog, but it appears there with no one owning it. Robin's recommendation is to

- a) Suppress the Bib record
- b) Unscope the item

Changing the item from scoped to unscoped removes your scoped holding from the bib. Suppressing the bib means that it is not sent to the central catalog.

So, we all need to pay attention to the Bcode3. Every once in a while it is wise to run a list of all the suppressed bibs in our local catalogs to find ones that are inadvertently suppressed.

At the end of these minutes, a copy of the email exchange with Robin is attached.

### **947 Field For Statistics**

Kathy reported that using the 947 field for statistics seems to be working well. Eden-Webster uses subfield *a* for the library name, subfield *b* for the cataloguer's initials, and subfield *c* for the date (year and month). Denise may start to use the 947 also for statistics.

### **Emptying and Releasing Review Files in MilCat**

Denise reported that when done with a review file in MilCat, it is not enough to empty the file. One also needs to release it. Otherwise, your initials are still associated with it and no one else can use it. (This does not apply to Telnet).

### **Internal Notes**

Denise reminded the Committee of the usefulness of the Internal Note field in item records. Covenant is finding this field to be more and more useful.

### **Linked Records**

Kathy showed an example of how Eden-Webster uses linked records to link items attached to a monograph record with set or serial records so that holdings show under both titles. To link and unlink records, open an item record and go to:

#### **Record**

##### **Additional Links**

**Add Link**

**Delete Link**

### **Helpful Hint**

Marty found that doing a barcode search for 0 and your proprietary beginning sequence of numbers was a way to uncover problem barcodes.

### **Serial Title Changes and Order Records**

Mary Ann asked if anyone using the Acquisitions system for serials had decided what to do in the case of a serial title change: whether to create a new order record on the new bib or to move the older order record to the new bib? No one at the meeting had any experience with this situation.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Bridges Cataloguing Committee meeting will be March 20, 2003, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. at Covenant Theological Seminary.

Here is the email discussion between Denise and Robin re unscoping and suppression.

My answers below are set off by \*\*\* Sorry I don't have a good solution for you, the cataloger needs to pay attention to the Bcode3.

Robin

Hi Robin,

We Bridges cataloguers have a number of questions regarding the use of unscoped locations and suppression. I think we know the answers, but thought I would run it by you to make sure there isn't something we don't understand.

The problem we are trying to solve is this:

Some of our libraries don't delete records when they weed books. For example, you have library A and library B. Library A weeds a book. Library B also owns the same book. So, library A suppresses their own item. This causes no problem.

However, if library B doesn't own the same book, then library A suppresses both the item and the bib record. Then library B purchases the same book and adds an item to the (suppressed) bib record, but forgets to unsuppress it. This has been causing some serious grumbling in Bridges.

\*\*\* The procedure that you describe for Library A is correct. I recommend in addition that they change the item location code to unscoped. If Library A suppresses both bib and item without changing to an unscoped location and Library B unsuppressed the bib, the bib is now multi and will display in each scope, without items in Library A.

I had the bright idea that maybe unscoped locations might help. If you unscope the bib, rather than suppressing it, then it looks great in your scope. However, it plays havoc with the cluster catalogue because you now have a stray bib with no location and no indication why it is there. This also happens in the MOBIUS catalogue, but at least there is a message that "No local information is available" (or some such message; I don't remember its exact text). In the cluster catalogue, an unscoped bib has no message at all.

\*\*\* Using the unscoped location without suppression does contribute the record to the MOBIUS Union Catalog. This would be very mis-leading to the patron who retrieves a record that no-one holds.

After talking it over with Per, we couldn't figure any way around this except to continue suppressing records and just running a list every once in awhile to find records that are inadvertently still suppressed and unsuppress them.

Which leaves me wondering what the purpose of unscoping is. Per thinks it is meant to be used in conjunction with suppression, and is mainly a statistical tool for keeping track of different types of things (like weeded books). What do other clusters use unscoping for? Also, what do other clusters do about the suppression problem? Just run periodic reports to catch records they've missed? Or is there anything we are missing?

\*\*\* Per is correct in that the unscoped location codes should be used in conjunction with suppression codes. Some of the uses of the codes are indeed statistical, how many items did we withdraw this year? How many items did we discard this year? Some libraries use the unscoped locations/suppression codes for orders that are never going to be filled but they want to retain the information (Out of Print, Never Published, etc.) so they don't try to re-order. Some libraries use this combination for serials that are routed only to staff and are not available to the public, or for bib/order records for memberships.

Denise