NOTIS USERS GROUP MEETING 1991

My schedule at NUGM was as follows:

Wednesday, October 2:

8:30 - 9:30	General Session (#1)
9:45 - 11:15	Staff Training R5.0
11:30 - 12:30	Minimal Level Cataloging
12:45 - 2:00	Lunch
2:15 - 3:30	Experts: Cataloging/Authorities
3:45 - 4:45	GTO With OCLC
5:00 - 6:00	Transaction Logs
6:30 - 8:00	Reception

Thursday, October 3:

8:00 - 9:00	Cataloging/Authorities Special Interest Group Meeting
9:15 - 10:15	Authority Work Basics
10:30 - 12:00	TECH1 Primer for Cataloging/Authorities
12:00 - 2:00	Lunch and Poster Sessions
2:15 - 3:30	Cataloging Productivity
3:45 - 4:45	Consortium/Network Special Interest Group

Handouts are available for your perusal in Anne Sargent's office.

NUGM
October 2
Session #1 General Session

In this General Session, Jane Burke announced that ownership of NOTIS was transferred from Northwestern University to Ameritech on October 1, 1991. NOTIS is a separate, wholly owned subsidiary of the Ameritech Information Systems division. Jane Burke emphasized that NOTIS would remain its identity as a separate subsidiary. No personnel changes due to the transfer are anticipated. The principal reason given for this transfer was the opportunity for NOTIS to compete for more research dollars in the Ameritech corporation.

Jane Burke then turned to future plans for NOTIS. The programmers are busy working to make changes in release 5.0 of the Library Management System (LMS) that are being demanded by users. They are continuing to work on the user interface (including implementing the common command language) with the idea of adding more database services (including full text databases). They are now testing PACLink with systems other than NOTIS. Jane Burke closed her remarks with the statement that NOTIS is dedicated to listening to our comments.

John Kolman provided more details on current NOTIS projects. The following software has recently been completed:

- NOTISearch
- MDAS 1.2 (improved user interface, security, printing options)
- KeyNOTIS 1.1 (has all features of LMS release 5.0)
- GTO 3.0
- LMS 5.0 (over 250 errors from 4.6 were fixed)

The following software is under development:

- Location based catalogs
- Serials predictive check-in
- PACSearch (host to host connections using Z39.4 protocol)
- Navigator (menus to support multiple OPACs on a single screen)
- PACLink (its 2 components are PACSearch and PACLoan-ie ILL)

The following software is "on the horizon":

- LMS OPAC improvements (to include user interface improvements, performance improvements, MHI changes (new sort order and punctuation normalization), and improved OPAC searching (find commands for known itme searching, hypertext links to related works, and SCAN--searching in a browse mode)
- MDAS multiple print & download features
- LMS circulation redesign
- MDAS servers
- LMS X12 order and claim links to vendors

The NOTIS strategy for software development is to work on a consistent and easy to use interface, improve staff productivity, and make their software highly customizable. In answer to the question "when?", John Kolman responded that PACSearch and Predictive Check-in will be in beta test sites by November 1991. Location based catalogs and Navigator will be in beta test sites by January 1992.

Maribeth Ward noted improvements that NOTIS has made in customer services in the last year, including improved documentation, more testing, new distribution procedures, and offering more advanced workshops.

NUGM
October 2
Session #6 Staff Training R.5.0

Brenda Turner of Purdue explained how staff were trained for 5.0 at her institution. Her methodologies included hans on practice, lecture with flipchart, and exercises (see p. 98 of NUGM notebook #1). Everyone on staff participated; they were not segregated by past NOTIS experience levels. (She said this worked.) Her evaluation results were particularly interesting (see p. 92). Her advice: don't train call number searching thru keyword. Take care of yourself! Be sure that information gets to all staff members. Distribute documentation ahead of time.

Helen Goldman described her plan for training at Auburn University, but she did not have any results to share because implementation has been delayed at Auburn until Thanksgiving.

Joan Butler of the University of Michigan described LSYS training. The initial decisions about securities were difficult. Because tables are still interrelated, she recommended that only a very few people be authorized for updating LSYS.

Questions and answers focused on 5 points: 1. Be consistent. 2. Don't try to do too much. 3. Make training required!! 4. Provide ongoing training.

NUGM
October 2
Session #14 Minimal Level Cataloging

Steven Mussett of the University of Evansville described the minimal level cataloging records created for bachelor and masters papers in their collection. They used public services staff (great idea!) and template records. (See handouts in NOTIS notebook #1.)

Betsy Hine of Indiana State University described the minimal level records used for their dance band sets music collection, locally produced videos, and career center information. She reminded the audience that minimal level records are permanent; use provisional ones if you're going to overlay them someday. She also suggested using template records. Authority work was done for minimal level records. The career center information was not cataloged; records were created directly from the collection. (Perhaps we could do annual reports and/or CoOp reports like this.)

NUGM
October 2
Session #21 Experts: Cataloging and Authorities

Margaret Rohdy reviewed the new Technical Services workflow at the University of Pennsylvania. They begin a permanent NOTIS record immediately. There are 3 categories of records: 1) full record downloaded (clerk) 2) some work needed (cataloger) 3) no record copy available (await copy).

Bob Wolven of Columbia University talked about "bound with" items. His advice was to use many references back and forth to minimize confusion. He refers to the first record in the volume (same as UDM).

Amey Park of Kent State University described her use of new headings lists. Name and subject authority is actually done before cataloging because the lists are generated when bibliographic records are input at point of acquisition. Series work is done post cataloging. (This is the opposite of UDM practice.) She has a librarian, 2 paraprofessionals, and student assistants devoted to authority control; the reports go through these peoples' hands in reverse of the order listed.

Alice Permenter of Loyola University of Chicago reported that approximately 75% of her authority work is done by student assistants. She also commented that error reports 2, 3, and 4 of MHI replace the dropped headings reports of earlier indexes.

Mary Charles Lasater of Vanderbilt University advised us to claim Library of Congress Subject Headings under release 4.6.1. Apparently there are problems in release 5.0. She also urged caution using the GLOB command.

NUGM
October 2
Session #30 GTO with OCLC

Melissa Laning of the University of Louisville urged caution when setting GTO parameters. They set most to "no" and are creating copy holdings, etc. manually after transfer. They are using PASSPORT software to do multi-tasking on workstations. This warrants investigation. (See handout p. 384.)

NUGM
October 2
Session #39 Transaction Logs

Jane Aitkens explained the way McGill University manipulates data from transaction logs generated by NOTIS using a database management package.

More intersting was Nikki Meyer's explanation of how Vanderbilt University is using SAS reports to manipulate data from transaction logs. The handout on p. 490 indicates what data is recorded on their logs. The only thing logs can't reveal is whether the patron got what s/he wanted in the end. It is also difficult to tell when one user ends and another begins (they parse into approximate sessions with a 3 minute gap). Vanderbilt creates archive tapes of their transaction logs every month. They log all terminals, including staff terminals. Looking at transaction logs provides information about remote users too. We should be looking at these!

NUGM
October 3
Special Interest Group Meeting: Cataloging/Authorities

The meeting was convened at 8:10am by Margaret Rohdy (University of Pennsylvania). She encouraged members of the SIG to complete evaluation forms throughout NUGM to provide feedback for SIG planners of NUGM 1992.

Mary Monson gave two reports: Anaclare Evans (Wayne State University) was introduced as the new chair-elect of the SIG. She then presented the results of the 1991 Enhancement Survey. Three of the overall top ten enhancements came from this SIG:

- #1 Enhanced editing capability
- #9 Ability to delete or resequence copy statements
- #10 Shelfist (call number) index

The SIG mailing list was circulated and updated.

Two issues were brought forth for discussion: the online shelflist and analytics. NOTIS is awaiting information from users about requirements for the online shelflist; this information is being coordinated by the SIG.

Ideas for handling analytics were solicited. Responses from members included:

--Link the item record to more than 1 copy statement.

--Universal message in the copy holding statement to send user to the record with the item record attached.

--Wait for NOTIS to fix.

Other points made included the conviction that the patron shouldn't have to do anything extra to get circulation information about a title and a question about how to handle partial analytics. Essentially, the SIG wants 1) Separate bibliographic information for each part, 2) Circulation information displayed for each part, and 3) A link to force deletion of analytics when the first is deleted (i.e. easy maintenance). Volunteers were requested to work with NOTIS on this.

Two future enhancements were suggested: automatic update of the copy holdings statement date when changes are made and global change for authority records.

Volunteers to create bylaws for the SIG were recruited as the meeting closed.

NUGM
October 3
Session #47 Authority Work Basics

Helen Goldman (Auburn University) reported that the only problems they had using GTO with authority records were local electrical ones; the software works well.

Jay Lambracht (University of Illinois at Chicago) reported that the conflict and error detection reports are the same in release 5.0 as they were in release 4.6. See handouts in NUGM Book 2 pp. 533 for ideas for solving conflicts and errors. The authorities workflow in his institution is integrated into that of the Cataloging Department, similar to the situation at the University of Detroit Mercy. His general strategy for dealing with the conflict and error reports is to find out how many conflicts/errors of each type there are, compare the time neccessary to correct each type and the amount of time available, deal with groups of problems (machine changes), get rid of the ones that will most affect the public first, and print each problem type separately to facilitate his plan. He reminded us that the file is getting better every day as we make changes.

Diane Lucas described how the University of Pittsburgh uses the new/dropped headings lists. All authority work (names, subjects, and series) for Library of Congress copy cataloging is done post cataloging.

Note to the University of Detroit Mercy Cataloging Department: We must fix as many authority problems as humanly possible before release 5.0 reveals them to the public!

NUGM
October 3
Session #56 A Tech 1 Primer for Cataloging and Authorities

Michael Kreyche (Kent State University) described what MARC records really look like to a computer and how they are input into NOTIS. (See handouts p. 640-644.) Remember that computers cannot read characters, they read numbers. ASCII is one character set defined by numbers. The library community has its own standards to accomodate all languages and associated symbols. NOTIS runs on IBM mainframes which run the EBCDIC character set, which must be translated to ASCII.

There are four methods of inputting MARC records into NOTIS. Magnetic tapes can be batch loaded with two NOTIS programs; the first one translates the record into the proper character set and the second one puts the records in the NOTIS MARC format. The screen to screen transfer is more involved. Basically, OCLC makes the MARC record look nice on the OCLC screen; the OCLC screen contents are printed in one big field to the NOTIS screen; NOTIS software parses and translates the information on the screen to the NOTIS internal format and then displays it to look nice on the NOTIS screen. Manual inputting is simply typing record information directly into NOTIS. Generic Transfer Overlay (3.0) works with standard and translator programs. The internal OCLC MARC record is translated to USMARC for export and translated to NOTIS MARC when it's received by NOTIS software. Validation of records input into NOTIS varies by method of inputting; little validation is done with tape loads, validation is done for manual input and screen transfer based on the tag tables, and GTO checks and reports errors via a log.

A batch index (a,t,s) is created when the program is run. A dynamic index (MHI) is updated as each record is updated. When indexing of either type occurs, the headings are normalized and validated; all characters are changed to upper case (upper case and lower case letters have different character set numbers) and punctuation is eliminated.

Barbara Hieber (University of Pittsburgh) described how tables for the cataloging and authority modules work. Tables communicate information about institution group, processing unit, locations, security, and service units. She provided excellent handouts in the NOTIS book 2 p. 645-653. She suggested inputting tables for 5.0 in the following order: locations, then technical processing group, then security. Other observations she made about 5.0 tables: data entry is cumbersome and slow; no way to print tables using the NOTIS software; no record of when changes are made to the tables; must centralize changes to keep track of them as a manual audit trail is now necessary.

Kay Flowers (Rice University) talked about how data is manipulated and extracted for reports. The new/dropped headings lists have been generated two ways. For a,t,s indexes, versions of the a,t,s indexes were compared at intervals and the results printed in reports. For the merged headings index, snapshots of the MHI are compared.

Journals keep a running tally of activities on NOTIS; they provide statistics. NOTIS is moving towards using files instead of journals for this purpose.

Kay Flowers then described the MARC Output logic: SAS reads a portion of the bibliographic file; the holdings record is read and output with the bibliographic record as 949 field; the file is output to a test file; NOTIS MARC Out is run agains test file; and the converted test file is put out on tape.

Examples of possible SAS reports include cataloging statistics (if note fields are used consistently), new titles, circulation statistics, reserves, titles by location, etc.

NUGM
October 3
Session #64 Measuring Cataloging Productivity

Joyce D. Gartrell provided preliminary background on productivity. When measuring productivity, consider effectiveness, efficiency, quality, quantity, and timeliness. Proper tools must be provided in order for catalogers to be productive: machine resources, bibliographic tools, existing shelflists/catalogs, supplies, training, materials to catalog, etc. Consider interruptions (meetings, telephone, e-mail, rush jobs, vacation, downtime, etc.), environment (attitudes, public services pressures, staff vacancies, physical environment, etc.), and cataloger (experience, subject specialty, format specialty, etc.).

Cheryl Kugler and Nikki Meyer (both of Vanderbilt University) described the methods they have adopted to compile cataloging statistics via NOTIS using SAS. They have based their system on inputting codes into the copy holdings records to indicate who cataloged what when. Consistency is the key to making this work.

NUGM
October 3
Session #74 MHLD For Monographs

Elaine Henjum (Florida Center for Library Automation) opened this session with definitions and a brief history of the ANSI/NISO standards for holdings display. These standards function for holdings the way AACR2 does for cataloging. The USMARC format for holdings and locations determines how this information is presented. The original ANSI/NISO Z39.42 standard for serial summary holdings became obsolete when the Z39.44 and Z39.47 standards for detailed holdings for serials and non-serials were created. The new standard that subsumes both of those is Z39.71, hte standard for holdings statements for bibliographic items. The format has not been able to keep up with these standards changes, so there will be more changes ahead. (The current format proposals are to handle Z39.57!)

The conversion options for converting holdings data from the volume holdings record to the MARC format for holdings (MHLD) are the same for monographs as for serials--the 899 field can accomodate non-MARC fields while the 866 field is subfielded. The two fields cannot be mixed; if an 899 appears in the record, the 866 does not display. Editing the MHLD is similar to that used for editing bibliographic records; be careful of defaults!

Michele Dalehite (Florida Center for Library Automation) noted that LSYS (the new serials control system) does not appear to use any of this information; it will have to be input in 2 places. Her advice is to use the 866/7/8 fields in the MHLD if at all possible because they are MARC defined.

Submitted by Anne M. Sargent
University of Detroit Mercy