

## Database Maintenance Advisory Council

January 20, 2004

ATTENDEES: Mary Ellen Bena, Lisa Bouchard, Mary Fellows, Rob Carle, Peg Mello, Lisa Pitkin, Geoffrey Kirkpatrick, Barbara ???, Gail Sacco, Carol Lagasse (CDLC), Sue Rahn (CDLC), Joe Thornton

MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 1, 2003 MEETING: The meeting began at 9:00 and the minutes from the previous meeting were approved without comment.

ITEM SPECIFIC REQUEST was the main topic of discussion, along with the changes that are desirable and doable to make that function more useful. Those changes include circulation and cataloging practices at the libraries, as well as changes to the iPac. The Database Maintenance Subcommittee presented a document (attached) explaining three options for the implementation of Item Specific Request, and the advantages and disadvantages of each. We clarified the decision process as follows: the subcommittee explained the options, the Database Maintenance Advisory Council will evaluate them and make a recommendation to ASC, who will make the decision about Item Specific Request.

Among the issues raised on this subject:

- ?? This is an important function for us to try to implement.
- ?? DVD's are different than VHS tapes.
- ?? We need better standardized cataloging (e.g. 505 field needs to match package). It may be hard to get all libraries to agree on standardized cataloging practices, but we should still try to get as close as possible.
- ?? We need to educate staff and patrons on the Item Specific Request process.
- ?? We need a better explanation of Item Specific Request on the iPac screen (Geoff noted that patrons are not sure what it means, and that 90% of requests are erroneous).
- ?? If we recommend the implementation of Item Specific Request to ASC, then it will be our responsibility to specify the implementation process.

Action items that came out of this discussion:

- ?? The UHLS Automation Services department will investigate our options regarding better help in the iPac, such as pop-up help windows, and the need for Dynix custom programming versus modifications we can make ourselves.
- ?? The Database Maintenance Subcommittee will draft a recommendation on standardized cataloging practices.
- ?? At our next meeting, we will use the results of the two preceding action items to make a recommendation to ASC.

SOURCE OF MARC RECORDS: Rob distributed a spreadsheet showing the alternatives under consideration. Some comments on the current tools:

Anything would be an improvement.  
The Horizon upgrade didn't help.  
In some ways it made things worse.  
The Z39.50 client is unacceptable.

Mary Ellen reported on some of the alternatives:

ITSMARC: couldn't get records into our system; too hard;

MARCIVE: not good; many records with no subject headings; records not as pristine as OCLC or ITSMARC; don't get records instantly; not worth \$15,000/year.

OCLC: Oh yeah. The undisputed queen of MARC records. BUT potentially too expensive. Comments: Can we put a cap on OCLC expenditures? Can we limit its use to a few large libraries?

Mary Fellows asked that we consider the Youth Services Advisory Council's recommendation regarding the importance of annotations in children's literature when making our choice of a MARC records provider. Annotations greatly improve the effectiveness of keyword searches. Other comments by Mary and others:

We should start a dialogue with ALA and LC about annotations.  
Maybe the Standards Subcommittee should consider this issue.  
There are MARC enrichment services.  
We have little local cataloging power to add annotations ourselves.  
LC is poor and OCLC very good with subject headings and annotations.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR CATALOGING: A lot of the work of the subcommittee made up the agenda for today's meeting. Rob said that Mary Fellows' annotation request will be addressed. He also thanked the subcommittee for their excellent work, and gave special credit and thanks to Sue Rahn and Carol Lagasse from CDLC for their contributions to the subcommittee and for Carol's work on the attached document outlining the options for Item Specific Requests.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, February 17, 2004 at 9:00 AM at UHLS.**

