

Union Catalog Committee Meeting
Minutes
Wednesday, January 30, 2013 10:00am

*Amy Shipley, GarCo [UCC Chair]
*Shannon Eagles, WSC
*Shelly Fratzke, SD#51
*Marilynn Huff, GCLD
*Anne Johnson, EVLD
*Mary Katherine Katzer, Marmot
Vic Mabus, Salida
*Carol McArdell, PCL
Kathy Mikol, GCLD

Karen Neville, CCU
Jo Norris, TOVPL
*Gail Owens, Basalt
*Alysa Selby, Bud Werner
*Penny Shiel, MCPLD
*Amy Sieving, WPL
*Jamie Walker, CMU
*Mary Walsh, ASU

Old Business:

(Mary Katherine)—Follow-up on Print items on electronic records – Mary Katherine has numerous examples

**After our last meeting, Alysa imported a number of bib records to move the print items to, for the records that had been put into a create list. There are still electronic resource records in the Marmot database that have print items attached. Mary Katherine will document a procedure for finding them and will send it out to the group so that each cataloger can focus on cleaning up their library's items that may be on incorrect bibs.

(Mary Katherine) Follow-up on Expansion of the OCLC Control Number “MK will ask III if the prefix really is stripped or just hidden from view.”

Mary Katherine had a conversation with Triple I about the ocn and ocm prefixes. In short, Rita at III said that the prefixes really are stripped from the 001 because of the command line in the specific load tables that perform a “validity check” on the 001. She went on to explain that the prefixes are added back to the 001 in the export mapping table. When Mark exports the bibs for the oPac, they go through the export mapping table. That is why we see a prefix on the 001 when we look at bibs in the staff view in VuFind.

Mary Katherine opened a ticket with Triple I on this issue, since we will most likely be in contact with them after more research is done regarding what is planned by OCLC for the changes in the OCLC numbers.

(Karen)—Follow-up on Moving information from 037 in bib record to item record

**Mary Katherine reported on this. A brief recap: the records for eContent need a specific field for Mark to target when contributing these bibs to the oPac. The first field we tried was the 037 (and that is what is still being used.) There are problems with using a bib marc field (having multiple 037s in a bib and the real possibility of the 037 being wiped out if/when an updated bib overlays the original record, being the most obvious reasons.) The second suggestion was to add an additional 856 that would contain the source of the eContent and the protection code. Again, the drawbacks of this solution are the same as that of the 037. And if the 856 is added to the item record, problems with the titles that are in the Marmot Digital library would most likely

result. Mary Katherine had a conversation with Mark to determine just what is needed for the eContent records. Since the data he needs can be pulled from the item records, Mark agreed that having a specific field in the item records would work best. Mary Katherine created a “service agreement” with Triple I to create a new variable length field and have it added to our item records. That field is supposed to be done by Friday, Feb. 1. She will work with Triple I to make sure the new variable length field can be populated by putting data into a subfield of the 949 line when adding the items at the same time as the bibs.

Mary Katherine also suggested the use of codes in the icode1 field in the item records. Other consortia have done this. Given the number of members that use the icode1 field for specific purposes, this idea was dismissed. Also, using the icode2 field won’t work, since so many of the electronic items need the icode2 to be a “p” to keep them out of Prospector.

It was suggested that we ask Triple I for another fixed length field to be added to the item records. It could be used in conjunction with the new variable length field to provide the data needed for the eContent facets. Mary Katherine will talk with Mark about exactly what is needed and will send a message to this group, as well as to the eBook TF, when a final solution has been determined.

(Jimmy)—Is there any update on the SkyRiver quote?

**Mary Katherine reported for Jimmy. The bottom line is that SkyRiver is no less expensive (and in some cases more expensive) than what Marmot libraries are currently doing with OCLC, vendor records, and other methods of cataloging. Upon being asked if this issue should be closed, Mary Katherine responded that it could be taken off the table until it’s opened again by a Marmot member or if anything changes with SkyRiver.

New Business:

(Amy)—Regular meeting time doesn’t work for Shelly Fratzke. She is the only rep from a school library. Can we find another time?

We decided to meet one hour earlier. Our meeting time will be 9am on the last Wednesday of the month. Our next meeting is Wednesday, February 27 at 9am.

(Penny)—Vendor records vs. incoming bibliographic records

Penny’s items are getting stuck on brief order bibs due to workflows in Acquisitions libraries. It is the responsibility of each Acquisitions library to make sure that their brief bibs get removed when their full bib comes in. Amy will set up a meeting with the Acquisitions group to demo the Telluride workflow that is working well for Telluride, Grand County and Garfield County.

(Amy)—Multiple parts on media and bib level holds

Amy wanted to know a solution for bib level holds placed on an order bib that are being filled by pieces of the set once other libraries attach their items. Alysa suggested changing Garfield County patrons’ bib level holds to item level holds when Garfield County items come in. This was a great solution and Garfield County will implement this procedure.

(Penny)—Letter to Jimmy to ask for more Create Lists files

There was no need to write a letter to Jimmy since he came into the conference room at the end of the December meeting and Penny mentioned the need for more create lists to him then. He

got a quote from Triple I, Mary Katherine did the bucket configuration with Triple I and the last week of February, the capacity for 625,000 more records will be added to create lists. (This was not included in the meeting, but here is what will be added to the end of the current review files: 23 files totally 625,000 records. 5 @ 1,000; 10 @ 3,000; 4 @ 25,000; 1 @ 40,000; 1 @ 50,000; 2 @ 200,000. Files of these sizes and the number of them was chosen after scrutinizing what size buckets were being used at the time and how many empty buckets of various sizes there were. Keith has said he can re-portion the records if there is a need.)

(Angela)—How are other libraries handling local holdings on Nooks?

(Mary Katherine)—Discussion of duplicate records and the continuation of their removal
**After a brief discussion, the UCC members agreed whole-heartedly that the request to continue funding a part-time person to focus on removing duplicate records should be made. Amy will write such a request and send it to Jimmy.

(Mary Katherine)—Use of icode1 field

** see section above regarding the 037 field under “old business”