

Cataloging AC Minutes 11/7/19

Present: Stephanie Anderson (APL), Lisa Bouchard (BETH), Rob Carle (UHLS), Sue Dague (EGRN), Joe Nash (COLN), Heather Nelson (GUIL), Lisa Pitkin (GUIL), Michele Reilly (VOOR), Catherine Stollar Peters (BETH), Joe Thornton (UHLS)

Old business:

1. At the last meeting Stephanie had asked for a report of “in-house use” so APL can track the use of some items that don’t get checked out. Joe needed some clarification, such as which fields to include in the report, which Stephanie supplied. Joe will work on it. .

Agenda:

1. *Material code for Library of Things? Should we have one? We can now have an unlimited number of material types (200). (Rob)*
 - a. Rob could make a global change using the 500 tag that most libraries created containing “Library of Things.” He would change the *Sierra* Material Type to “Library of Things” if we create that Material Type. An advantage of this would be that *Encore* facets would then include “Library of Things” and patrons would be better able to locate them.
 - b. Catherine said we might want a “Computer” Material Type.
 - c. At the next meeting we’ll discuss if we want more Material Types and which ones if we do.
2. *Question from one of my co-workers: “We would like to make LOT items requestable *but* we want them to be picked up and returned here (no delivery). It looks as though Bethlehem does this by using itype 120 and loan rule 70. Do you think we can do this? We want everything else to stay the same (14 day loan, \$1 fine per day, no renewal).” (Sue)*
 - a. Joe said that LoT items must be nonrequestable because he has not included rows for every library in the Loan Rule Determiner table to accommodate LoT checkouts. We have four LoT Item Types and they might include anything from wifi hotspots to cake pans, and it’s unlikely that every library will have the same loan policies for the “Library of Things #1” Item Type. So LoT items should only be checked out at the items’ owning libraries.
 - b. Catherine described BETH’s use of “local request.” Basically they have two types: 1) items that are requestable only by BETH patrons but can be picked up anywhere, and 2) items that are requestable by BETH patrons but must be checked out and returned at BETH. This requires staff action -- they don’t send the items to other libraries.

3. *My director has tasked me with the following:*

Can you look at the list of “Billed, not paid” items in our catalog and try to clean it up/make some recommendations?

1. *Look for items on our shelves*
2. *Determine if we have already replaced that item*
3. *If we have not replaced it, create a list of high priority items to replace*
4. *Determine if there are specific families that we should be reaching to get these items back*
5. *Determine if there are any specific patrons that would benefit from some sort of outreach amnesty (eg. They lost the items years ago and have not been back)*

I determined we have some 3,400 items with a billed status. I’m stymied as to how to gather the information she is asking for with such a large number of items.

I’m looking for suggestions and advice as to how to approach this project. (Sue)

- a. Sue reminded us that seven years ago or so we deleted items that were billed and not paid, and for which no one expected to see the items again or collect any fines or fees. We think that was part of our preparation for the migration to *Sierra*.
- b. Sue said EGRN is considering an amnesty program to get the items back and reduce the number of old billed items.
- c. UHLS will look into reports (existing or to be written) that could help with this type of cleanup.
- d. We’ll make this (database cleanup) an agenda item for our next meeting.

4. *I can give an update on RFID at GPL. (Lisa P)*

Lisa described GUIL’s RFID project and distributed a handout describing the equipment the library will use for the conversion.

5. Catherine asked whether we should continue to add/update the 245\$h subfield in our MARC records. We’ll discuss this at a future meeting.
6. We had a brief discussion about the *MarcEdit* program, inspired by the recent workshop given by its creator, Terry Reese. Everyone who uses it loves the tool. Joe asked if *MarcEdit* has a role to play in our daily workflow. The consensus is that it’s very useful for the people who use it for their specific tasks, but probably not useful as a tool for the general library tasks that we all do every day.

Next meeting December 5, 2019