

DALNET DATABASE STRUCTURE TASK FORCE MEETING  
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY, DEAN'S CONFERENCE ROOM  
APRIL 22, 1998 , 9:30—NOON

Present: Randy Call, DPL; Robert Marcelain, Circulation, DPL; J. Houser, DPL; A. Fidler, Systems, WSU; J. Trzeciak , Systems ,WSU; S. Homant, UDM; K. Bacsanyi, Purdy Library, WSU; Cindy Yonovich, WCCC; M. Sheble, UDM; M. Auer, UDM and Chair of DALNET BOARD; G. Marck, Systems, WSU; B. Heath, Technical Services, WSU; P. Jose, Oakland County Library; Jim Green, Systems, WSU; Anaclore Evans, Systems, WSU.

Ameritech representatives: Randall Jones, Steve Neilsen, Jan Sheppard, Harry Masek

Goal for the sessions—Make a recommendation for the database structure for DALNET HORIZON to the Steering Committee which will be forwarded to the DALNET BOARD.

KEY DALNET-WIDE DECISIONS

DATABASE STRUCTURE OPTIONS—DATABASE INDEX OPTIONS-DATABASE MIGRATIONS STRATEGIES

Currently the DALNET database consists of 4.2 million records and over 20 libraries. What will be the best structure for DALNET under Horizon? What are the advantages and disadvantages of a single bibliographic record and shared authority files? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each library having their own database? Are there advantages to include a grouping of like libraries such as the hospital libraries? Are there advantages to share an authority file and patron files? What are the implications for the displays to the public and workload for the technical service staff? And others.

Steve Neilsen, Product Manager of Horizon and Jan Sheppard, cataloging and database specialist, provided a presentation and a discussion of a variety of questions from the audience.

DALNET members must choose between three possible options:

OPTION A—one database and shared bibliographic records

OPTION B—each library has its own database with Z39.50 linking between catalogs

OPTION C—like option B but having clusters of libraries, such as the hospital libraries, sharing a database

All situations can share a patron file. One card could be used within the libraries. Does not require one bar code, could have multiple bar codes. How long does it take to load a database? How long to update? Patron authentication will come with WebPAC version 1.3. What is needed for reports—fields must be indexed. It is better to have a common code, and select from those code options. For reciprocal borrowing privileges what is the best structure? What are the security issues? What part of the record can be shared? Is there a difference between remote or local access? Can patrons view their fines and fees? How do you run reports for your own location? The project Record Ownership is targeted for completion in November. What about attaching URLs? Advantages to B or C are that you do not slow anyone else down when you add libraries databases during migration. Ameritech tech people would love to have all data from all libraries at one time, however that is not realistic. Horizon allows indexing in any field.

Indexing/profiling is critical to your database. Horizon provides a standard list of a number of indexes, 64 indexes are available with templates. Other critical issues are hardware. DALNET will have two servers one mirroring the other. In B and C, catalogers can connect to any Horizon database and copy from one to the other. The issue of authority records in each possibility A or B was discussed. Could a resource file help all libraries? Could LCSH, MESH, LC Juvenile subject authority be shared?

Once a profile has been developed and the indexes identified, test records need to be assembled. The set should include all different kinds of records to see what kind of problems that might occur in a test load. UDM has completed their profiling and identified the indexes they need. They must now provide a test database of their records.

A number of catalogs are available on the Ameritech home page. <http://harry.amlibs.com/>. Try them out.

Another good one not on the list is INDYCAT:  
[www.indycat.iupui.edu/](http://www.indycat.iupui.edu/)

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Bacsanyi, Purdy Library  
Wayne State University

DALNET Database Structure Discussion  
April 22, 1998 1:30-4:30 pm  
Wayne State University, Purdy Library, Simons Room

Afternoon session 1:30-4:30 Simons Room

Over 50 people were in the Simons Room to see demonstrations of the public mode of Horizon. Attendees were from community colleges, WSU, many people from DPL and UDM libraries, Walsh College, and several special libraries. All of DALNET was well represented.

Members from the Ameritech staff included Harry Masek, Randall Jones, Steve Neilsen, and Jan Sheppard.

**KEY DALNET-WIDE DECISIONS –Steve Neilsen, Ameritech**

Steve Neilsen provided a presentation on the Horizon system.

DALNET members must choose between three possible options:

OPTION A—one union database

OPTION B—each library having its own database with Z39.50 links to other catalogs.

OPTION C—like option B but having clusters of libraries, like the hospital libraries, sharing a database.

Steve provided a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each, for DALNET's setting and timetable.

Of major importance is the indexing for the database. Horizon provides a standard list of 64 indexes with templates to choose from but it is also up to each library to choose their own look for their PACs (Public Access Catalog). A variety of Horizon public catalogs can be accessed at : <http://harry.amlibs.com/> The catalog at Cal State Chico was demonstrated as well as the Health sciences ECCLES. Horizon has also been chosen to link all the CAL State University Public catalogs.

Questions from the audience included:

Questions about patron validation and ILL. How is that managed in a variety of systems.? The California system allows unmediated ILLs. Valerie Chase another Ameritech member will be coming back to Detroit in May and will provide a demonstration of the ILL system.

How are upgrades to the system handled? What are the issues of security for each library? What about blocks on the patron? Should the system have commonality in the basic format of PAC views, and labels across the systems? How are statistical categories handled? What cataloging standards should be included?

A lively question and answer session continued. Any comments could be sent to Ana Fidler at the Systems Office in the Sci/Eng Library by Friday, April 24<sup>th</sup> and will be forwarded to the Database Structure Task Force Chairperson.

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen Bacanyi, Purdy Library, Wayne State University