

Minutes
Prospector Cataloging Reference Committee Meeting
April 19, 2007

Present: Mary Beth Chambers (chair), Barbara Allen, Pam Blome, Lloyd Chittenden (via phone), Gene Gardner, Virginia Inness, Janet Lee, Terri Lewis, George Machovec, Debbie McCarthy, Betty Meagher, Beth Oehlerts, Helen Reed, Janet Ryan, Mary Sacoman, Sarah Steen, Jina Wakimoto, and Cynthia Wilson.

1. Alliance announcements from George:

- A. Denver Public Library:** There are still problems with DPL, their borrowing/lending is currently turned off.

- B. DCB:** The DCB or “The Box” that would allow any brand of outside system to interact with an InnReach site is in prototype now, but it is quite expensive. Alliance folks have visited with Pikes Peak Library District and Douglas County folks about it. Groups in South Carolina and Michigan are the first to give it a try.

- C. Prospector Staff Website:** The Alliance is working on a redesign of the Prospector Staff website—ideas are welcome. It should be ready to view at the next meeting.

- D. BCODE3=g, report on an old problem:** Use of BCODE3 g seems to be cropping up again. *Reminder:* do not use BCODE3 g. The g code suppresses all holdings information from public view. The BCODE3 g does not have to be on the master record for this to occur. If any contributing library uses BCODE3=g on a record, everybody’s holdings are suppressed. These are mainly occurring on NetLibrary records. The record will display with a link to the resource, but there is no way to tell who the owning libraries are. This can cause misunderstandings with patrons who are unable to access the resources.

- E. Book cover displays:** The Shared Collection Committee would like to know if member libraries want to see book covers displayed in Prospector. If we implement this service, there would be some technical issues to deal with since there is only one outbound link allowed, and some libraries would like to have a link to bookstores or to Amazon for their patrons. Some Prospector libraries, such as Jefferson County, currently display book jackets in their local catalogs. Cynthia cautioned that incorrect images do sometimes appear with bib records. Other issues to consider are whether or not to display additional content such as tables of contents and abstracts. A couple of the vendors who supply book cover images, etc. are Syndetics and Content Café. If the book cover and/or other features are desirable to member libraries, George would have to contact III about the possibilities for opening up the one outbound lane. Also, it could be expensive to add the feature(s), and

because there are costs involved, George would have to run it by the Prospector directors for approval. George asked all to discuss the matter with their public service people to get their feedback for our next discussion on the matter. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting.

2. Business:

- A. **InnReach Enhancements.** Committee members reviewed the list of enhancement proposals and gave George feedback on which to support and at what level. He will vote on behalf of Prospector. Enhancements voting closes on May 4.
- B. **Batch loading practice:** Betty reported on a new recommendation for batch loading. The encoding level on batch loaded materials should be “u” for unknown rather than L as previously recommended. This should safeguard electronic records from overlaying print records. It would also solve the Flatirons Consortium problem reported by Terri—level L is an OCLC defined code, and Flatirons is not an OCLC participant; however, “u” is a valid MARC 21 code. Betty further recommended that, when possible, libraries review records for electronic books before they are loaded to make sure that ISBNs matching print versions of the books are in 020 |z rather than 020 |a to avoid having them merge with records for their print versions available in Prospector. Libraries should talk to their vendors about the 020 issue to make them aware of the importance of placing print 020s in |z. The “Best Practices” will be edited to reflect these changed recommendations.
- C. **ERM at Boulder/Prospector Display:** Jina reported that CU Boulder is using the III Electronic Resource Management module to manage their E-books as well as their serials. They are using the “resource level record” option and using their link resolver, Serials Solutions, to tie into the resource record in their catalog. In Prospector this caused Boulder’s holdings to display in three lines—item, check-in, and 856 url. By placing the URL in a 956 instead of the 856, they were able to eliminate one of the three lines, the item line, in the Prospector display, but now the URL hot link does NOT appear in Prospector. An example of this is the title: *Literary remains of King Edward the Sixth* [electronic resource]. Another record is *Educating new Americans* [electronic resource].
- D. **Display problems with e-resource records without local item records:** The committee revisited the issue of display problems that occur in Prospector when a library does not attach item records to e-resources bib records in their local catalogs--the url associated with the library’s record does not behave correctly if no local item record is attached. There seem to be various types of problems that occur. Best advice is for Prospector libraries to add item records to their e-resource bib records, such as NetLibrary records, to prevent these problems.

- E. Itypes:** Local systems should use item types **below 200**, reserving the number 200 and above for InnReach to avoid conflicts with Prospector Itypes. Each library's Itype is mapped to a central set of values in the Prospector system. If a Prospector library adds a new Itype to its local system, George should be notified so that the new local code is mapped to the appropriate Prospector value. If the system does not recognize a local system's Itype, it will map it to the default value of "non-requestable" in Prospector. George will send a message to Prospector members via the email list to remind them of the Itype situation as well as the bcode3=g issue discussed earlier.
- F. Daily Record Link Maintenance and Pascal:** Jina asked if any libraries are using the daily record link maintenance feature to update bib locations overnight for Pascal. Helen said that UNC opted not to use it since it created too many problems. Overall, the number of Pascal sites is very small.
- G. Authority records in databases:** Pam mentioned that a possible enhancement to Voyager databases would be including authority records in the public OPAC. There was consensus that this would be a very bad idea and they definitely did NOT want any such records contributed to Prospector
- H. New OCLC numbers with OCN prefix.** The records contributed by Voyager libraries will not merge with the Innovative records, and will be stand alone orphans in the Prospector database. So far, only original unique records have been added by Voyager libraries so Pam could not demonstrate this. There is guarded hope that the next upgrade could correct this. When there is an instance of this, Pam will inform the rest of the committee.

Next Meeting will be on July 19, same time and place.

Submitted by Pam Blome, April 30, 2007; revised and posted May 22, 2007