OCLC Enhance Sharing Session
ALA Midwinter Meeting 2006 – San Antonio, Texas
Sunday, 2006 January 22

Notes compiled by Shana L. McDanold, MLS, Assistant Professor, Serials and Non-Print
Formats Cataloger Pius XII Memorial Library Saint Louis University

Edited by Jay Weitz

Jay Weitz, Enhance Program coordinator was the session facilitator.

Jay called the session open at 4:00 pm.

I. Housekeeping
      A. Introductions of members present. Linda Gabel of OCLC was also present.
      B. Jay provided a brief explanation of the Enhance program.
      C. An attendance sheet was passed around.

II. News from OCLC – handout highlights
      A. Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources report.
      B. OCLC-MARC updates, these will be completed by end of June 2006.
            1. Highlights include the implementation of BLvl "i".
            2. There will be full details released in Technical Bulletin 252 sometime in
the next few months. There will be at least 6 weeks between the TB and implementation.
Also see the message titled "OCLC-MARC Update" on the OCLC-Cat list dated Jan. 26,
2006 and in OCLC Connexion News.
            3. Some conversions will take place after the update.
            4. Questions and answers regarding the update.

Q – What will be converted?
A – Conversions include integrating resources (+ find and identify them in the database)
and invalidation of the ISSN fixed field with conversion of data to field 022 (coordinate
with CONSER, etc.) among others.

Q – What about libraries without bibliographic notification services? How will they
know? Will it be possible to get the converted records through bib notification?
A – Only three circumstances trigger a record reissue for OCLC's Bibliographic
Notification: (1) upgrade of Encoding Level; (2) change/add/delete to field 505, based
on indicator values; (3) change/add/delete to field 856 subfields $u and/or $z. Except
where one or more of the character set changes in the OCLC-MARC Update causes a
character conversion in field 856 subfields $u and/or $z, it's unlikely that a record would
be reissued by Bibliographic Notification.

Q – What about conversions of character set changes and additions (i.e. pound sign to the
musical sharp)?

A – The conversion will happen, at least in access points. Some changes are behind the scenes changes, and others don't require conversions. We do need more differentiation between spacing and non-spacing characters when displaying in a box or drop down list.

Q – What about the conversion of the degree symbol? Superscript 0 is sometimes really just that rather than a degree.
A – Some characters will require more work, and we will try to limit conversions to things they are absolutely/close to absolutely sure about. We will leave the rest for people to report or Enhance libraries to change. OCLC hopes that the music libraries will do a lot of work on the musical character implementations. We also recognize that there are things they can and cannot convert, and will try to be very careful.

C. News not on handout – Union List Migration takes place on Feb. 17 (http://www.oclc.org/unionlist/migration/default.htm). At that point OCLC will retire Passport for Union Listing and will convert Union List management to the Connexion Browser interface.

D. Enhance Participants page (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/about/quality/enhance/default.htm) – This will be changing in the near future. Jay now has the option to edit the pages himself. Changes include breaking out the CIP upgrade partners (there are 6 of them: BKX, BWKUK, C#P, IG#, QBX, YDX) into their own chart at the bottom to be more informative about why we see those symbols so often.

III. Questions and answer period

Q – We have PromptCat for DLC/DLC records, and want to include PCC records as part of the program. We did a study and found a high percentage of errors in the full records from PCC libraries (042 PCC, ELvl blank). How can they report/inform OCLC about them? We cannot correct errors in PCC records as an Enhance library, but we don't want to accept them because the records require too much editing work on our part. What is the best way to report?
A – We definitely want to receive error reports, and use whatever mechanism they normally use (Web form, 952 field, etc.). PCC would want to know of errors, so they can detect patterns in errors. If you notice a pattern, please let them know. And please send a copy of the report when you are finished with the study.

Q – Sometimes there's a CIP record and a full member record for the same work. The CIP is a UKM record that was machine loaded after the full member record. Do you just report as a duplicate and use the full member record?
A – Yes, report the duplicate. UKM CIP records are not reliable information, especially in the 300 field.

Q – What about when we find duplicates and both records need Enhancing. Our current process is to Enhance a record, produce/update it, and then fill out duplicate form with the Enhanced record as the preferred "keep" record.

A – Yes, that process is acceptable. Use whichever record needs the least amount of work. OCLC doesn't always abide by the recommendations, but if one was Enhanced they do try to use that one. The old DDR (duplicate detection and resolution software) always preferred the older record when all else was equal; new DDR is not up and running yet, but development is progressing.

Q – For a National Level Enhance library, what is the acceptable practice for Enhancing a LC record? What goes in the Encoding Level? Especially when we've added to or edited access points in the record.
A – Please do the Enhance and fix the record. For PCC Core Level record being "upgraded" to full, change the Encoding Level, but leave the record as PCC (042). For records with Encoding Level 1 (full record but the item was not in hand), change the Encoding Level [because you have the item in hand (upgrade)] to 4 or blank. Otherwise, you wouldn't change the Encoding Level. Adding an "I" in the Encoding Level would be downgrading the record. [Linda Gabel] – Anyone can add a 505, so if you are correcting a typo, this is not a change in the Encoding Level. [Jay Weitz] And you can report the changes to LC, because the record will be not changed in the LC database, only in OCLC. OCLC does forward error reports to LC once records are corrected.

And don't forget that often answers about cataloging and cataloging policies/practices depend on who you ask.

Q – When records are uploaded, the duplicate detection process is not working well. And full level records are loaded as M level because they are tape loaded, but it still implies that they aren't full. This is different than RLG environment.
A – Originally there was more than one level for tape/batch loaded records, but we changed that to load most of them as M level to allow members to upgrade records. The Encoding Level of a record is good in theory, but in practice it's more or less worthless (almost meaningless), especially with tape/batch loaded records.

Q – What about Enhancing a CD with multiple performers, lots of soloists, lots of works on disc. OCLC record only had the soloists traced, we found all of the works (in either the authority file or in a bibliographic record in the OCLC database) except one, so what would be the Encoding Level once the works tracings were added?
A – It's a full level record after all of that work. Without establishing the works, then do it as an Encoding Level I rather than blank (for National Enhance participants), that way another library could establish it if they wanted to.
Q – [Linda Gabel] Do you control headings when can?
A/Q – Yes. We don't control them all, because of punctuation issues (it gets controlled with incorrect punctuation); and we don't use work around very often because it's a pain. Is that going to be fixed soon?
A – A significant fix to many of the control heading problems (including the subfield $4 issue) is scheduled to be installed on the weekend of 2006 February 18-19. An announcement will be distributed soon thereafter. Please control headings of authors because when death dates are added they will flip automatically. Remember that controlling helps with making headings automatically flip when edited.

Q – On an Encoding Level M, the call number used to be stripped out when it was loaded – this is not still done, right?
A – It's probably just not coming over. They are not stripped out, they may just not included in output because either they are not consistent or not easily extracted. It depends on institution's profile.

Q – We are constructing LC call numbers, and for original records we use 050 [blank]4. What do you do with a record that has a call # in a 050 that's incorrect when Enhancing the record? Do you add a duplicate call # in a 090?
A – If it's really wrong, replace it with a correct call #. If it's a matter of interpretation, add an additional call # in the same field (you can repeat an existing 050 with a second 050, or add a second 090 when there is no 050; but if you mix 050 and 090, the 090 will not be retained when the record is added to the database).

Q – Is 050 or 090 better to use for original?
A – Whichever. It really doesn't matter. But for retention, use the 050.

Q – Should analytic call #s also be added in a 050?
A – Yes. Prefer that duplicates are not added except in specific situations. And remember that an analytic call # can be added to the same in a second subfield $a (repeatable). Use the online guides (Enhance, etc.) for the specific situations.

The session was adjourned at 5:00pm.