SWAN Cataloging Advisory Group Meeting

March 14, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 n.

RAILS Burr Ridge
Main Meeting Room

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Vox/Read-Along Best Practices Final Draft
3. Combo Packs Update – Some options from the UX Team
4. "When to Input a New Record" guidelines revision

   BREAK

5. Establishing SWAN Core minimum cataloging requirements – Document draft
6. Fields to Delete in Copy Cataloging – Document draft
7. Open Discussion

The next Cataloging Advisory Group Meeting will be Thursday, May 9th at 9:30 a.m. in the RAILS Burr Ridge Main Meeting Room. This is a joint meeting with the Acquisitions Users Group.

---

1. Introduction

Reorganization

After our recent SWAN staff reorganization, we were proud to announce that Samantha Dietel has transferred onto the Bibliographic Services team. Sam brings her expertise with serials and acquisitions functions to the team, as Bibliographic Services will also be assuming oversight and support with these modules. Given the amount of crossover between these functions and cataloging, we believe this is a logical choice that will help us improve each process in tandem.

Discussion Forums

SWAN will be piloting a discussion forum in the near future, and that pilot will be on cataloging topics. This is still in the planning phase, but once we determine the best platform and format for our needs, we will invite the membership to sign up to chat about cataloging topics, ask questions, and give feedback. Be on the lookout for more information in this area. We are excited to see what a new avenue of communication can lend to our community.

Next Meeting

Our next meeting on May 9th will be a joint meeting between the Acquisitions Users Group and Cataloging Advisory. It will start half an hour earlier, at 9:30 a.m.

2. Vox/Read-Along Best Practices

The guidelines for cataloging Vox and other read-along books have been posted to the support site: Vox & Other Read-Along Formats. The document outlines the format requirements for these records and provides some genre headings, notes, and other fields that may be useful to you depending on the situation.

3. Combo Packs Update

We announced some progress we have made towards a solution to the Blu-Ray/DVD combo pack problem. The discussion began at our November meeting. After working with Tara Wood on SWAN's User Experience Team, we have come up with a couple of tweaks to the Format search facet in Enterprise that may help with our issues. Tara has formulated a method in which we could either:

1) Allow for two 590 fields to exist in one record, or
2) Split a single 590 field into two search results and facet options in Enterprise.

The first option would allow us to input two 590 fields, for example a 590 for DVD and a 590 for BLU-RAY, which would both be searchable in Enterprise.

The second option is similar but uses a single 590. As an example here, we could implement a 590 value of "COMBO PACK", but this field would not be visible in Enterprise. Instead, searches using both the "DVD" and the "Blu-Ray" search facets would yield Combo Pack results. So limiting a search to "DVD" would display both DVD and Combo Pack results. "BLU-RAY" would likewise yield both Blu-Ray and Combo Pack results.

The second of these options is appealing because the 590 would display in WorkFlows search results (with two 590s, only the first would display). This would make searching for and adding items to

combo pack records a much clearer process. Also, two 590 fields may lead to unclear format designations if the fields are not adjacent or seemingly conflicting values appear on one record.

We believe that a new 590 that functions like Option 2 paired with a re-education campaign and insistence that 590s for A/V materials cannot be changed under any circumstances may help make the Combo Pack problem easier to navigate. We will be writing a proposal for a new practice, including format facet implications, necessary fields for identification, and a plan for clean-up to be presented at our May meeting. If it is accepted by the group, we will begin implementation over the summer.

If we were to implement either option, note that both Blu-Ray and DVD format icons would display in Enterprise.

4. When to Input a New Record Guidelines Revision

SWAN is re-examining its guidelines on When to Input a New Record to better clarify them in light of changes made to the OCLC document. We believe this will be a good topic for the pilot of our Discussion Forums later this year, so we will be requesting feedback about this via that platform when it is launched.

Of particular note during the meeting were minimum differences in page counts and dimensions, book club editions with extra materials, and how this discussion relates to paperbacks vs. hardcovers.

Avon and Harlequin

The topic of Avon and Harlequin romance novels was brought up. These publishers are simultaneously publishing hardcover and mass market paperback versions of the same novel. Although the size and page count clearly warrant separate records, these are often appearing in OCLC on a single record. Cataloging staff are asked to be vigilant when processing these books and ensure that inappropriate ISBNs are removed and separate records made for each version of these books.

5. SWAN Core Minimum Standards

We discussed the draft document outlining our proposal for a set of SWAN Core Minimum Standards for cataloging. It is meant to outline all the required information for a bibliographic record to be complete in the SWAN database. The draft is based on a combination of RDA Core guidelines, the RAILS Cataloging Working Group standards outlined in a 2017 document, and our needs as a consortium. We received a lot of great feedback in this discussion, and we are looking for more.

The draft is available as part of the meeting packet alongside these notes on the Support Site's Meetings & Documents page.

If you are interested, please take a look at the document and send your thoughts to scott@swanlibraries.net. We will publish these on the support site on April 8th, so please feel free to share your thoughts through Friday, April 5th. If there are any areas that warrant a more in-depth discussion, we will redact them from the final version pending follow-up at the next Cataloging Advisory meeting.

Here are some questions that came up during the discussion. Feel free to weigh in on these pending issues:

1) Do we want to make $q required in 020 fields? The $q can be vital in identifying what ISBNs represent, especially those that may need to be removed from a record. On the other hand, copy cataloging may bring up records with long lists of 020s that do not have a $q, and researching these numbers to add the subfield may be prohibitively time-consuming.
2) Should we require a 264 _4 for copyright date always, or only when they differ? Is it possible to infer copyright date from a bracketed publication date?

6. Fields to Delete in Copy Cataloging

As with the SWAN Core Standards, this is a document draft on which we are looking for feedback. It is a list of fields or subfields that should be deleted from copy cataloging before records are brought into the SWAN database. We will also publish this April 8th, to try to send feedback by April 5th.

The draft is available as part of the meeting packet alongside these notes on the Support Site's Meetings & Documents page.

Questions to consider:

1) There are some subject vocabularies missing from this list. Would the subject/genre portion of this document be better served as a "Fields to Retain" for simplicity?
2) Should we retain subject headings in other languages for any particular vocabulary? (In particular, consider Spanish-language Bilindex [$2 bidex] and QLSP [$2 qlsp] headings.)

7. Open Discussion

946 Fields Disappearing

Libraries are concerned that the 946 signature field is disappearing from fully cataloged records. We are unsure why this is happening, but SWAN will attempt to investigate. If you find any examples of this, please send them to SWAN Support for follow-up.

Baker & Taylor Records Missing 260/264

Some records appearing as vendor pre-cats from Baker & Taylor are very sparse, often missing vital publication data. We have been in touch with a handful of libraries about this, and Baker & Taylor is currently in the process of updating their grid. We will monitor this issue and keep track of their progress on this update.

Chronology Project Update

The we implemented this January to serials call numbers has been going well. As a reminder, we no longer include enumeration (volume) information on the majority of our serial call numbers, preferring chronology (dates) only. The Bibliographic Services team has been auditing call number information and reaching out to libraries that still need to make a change. We will continue to monitor serial records and perform cleanup until we are confident the change has been implemented across the board.