

Aleph Working Group September 12, 2006

Present: Aaron Bales, Tom Hanstra, Pascal Calarco (presiding), Mandy Havert, Mary McKeown [?], Pam Nicholas, Kevin Bowers, Phil Andrzejewski, Kitty Marschall

1. Aleph Shared Systems Proposed Model

Large Scale Shared Systems Initiative (LaSSSI [?]), a user group of large consortia, has been very active in getting a simplified workable model of Aleph for consortia. The current proposal is the first draft, comments are due by the end of the month, then a revised edition will be drafted. This particular version proposes shared bibliographic, authority, and patron files. Admin, circulation, acquisition, budget, item and local patron records would be locally controlled. Vendor files could be shared or not. Should MALC opt for the plan, Pascal proposes to migrate to version 18 before trying to address the changes necessary for the shared system model. By using the multiple bibliographic record model for the union catalog, most of the worries about proprietary notes, etc would be eliminated. There would be increased complexity to the tables, particularly the indexing tables. Indexing for the individual MALC institutions, as well as for the Union catalog would necessarily be maintained in fewer, but larger tables. The net effect of this on the workload is hard to predict. The shared authority file poses larger problems. Each institution is at a very different stage in authority control. Notre Dame has imported and created records for the longest time. Local records may exist for headings that now have established authority records. Both Bethel and Saint Mary's have been less consistent in addressing authority control, and have small files, but may have newer versions of the records. Major issues: * how to de-dupe authority records if we load everyone's files

- will many conflicting cross references be generated?

Other issues: Concern about adding the OWN field back into the records was expressed. Permissions for the GUI client were discussed, Mary M. was curious whether catalogers would be able to see the records held by other libraries, and be able to derive records from them. Mandy was curious about the supposed difficulties using version check with this consortia modal.

2. Direct Consortial Borrowing (Patron Direct Queue or PDQ)

This model would require shared patron base, a union catalog, and unique barcode numbers for patrons and items across all institutions. The meaning and use of patron statuses also needs to be standard across all member institutions. Of these, MALC has a shared patron base, with unique barcode numbers, and agreement on the patron status codes. MALC would have to move to a union catalog before PDQ would be possible. Pascal noted that staffing would probably be a major issue, and should be addressed before this was put into place. The worst and most difficult hurdle to this plan is the huge number of duplicate barcodes on the items in all 4 MALC institutions. (This would also be a problem for the union catalog plan.) Although for the last several years, the small MALCs have been using unique codes (i.e., the second digit indicates which MALC the barcode belongs to: SMC barcodes start 07---), there are thousands of barcodes duplicates across the system, some of them appearing in all 4 libraries. Aaron offered to create a web form that would automatically search all 4 catalogs and report duplicates. The committee discussed possible uses for this: circulation could scan returned books and have duplicate barcodes replaced, CADM could scan the pieces they were working on (might be more effective, as CADM works on many older titles.) Tom Hanstra offered to run reports on the number of duplicates. Kitty Marschall asked if this shouldn't be addressed as a prelude to further action on shared resources.

3. Authorities Working Group for Bethel

Kevin reported that he had checked with some vendors, and more or less decided on MARCive. However, he questioned whether the library should continue, if MALC was going to be using the union catalog model with a shared authority file. After some discussion, he concluded they would follow through, but that it would not be necessary to establish a formal working group. Phil will work with Kevin setting up the tape extraction to go to the vendor, and scheduling the load process when the clean copy is returned. Mary M. offered to answer questions about cataloging related questions.

4. Serial Acquisitions:

Acquisition Methods and Order Group codes Pam Nichols discussed new codes that were created for serial acquisitions. New acquisitions methods codes and order material type codes were created to improve data extraction, statistic collection, and report writing.

This topic: [MalcWiki](#) > [WebHome](#) > [AlephWorkingGroup](#) > [AlephWorkingGroup20060912Minutes](#)

History: r1 - 07 Jan 2008 - 15:33:40 - [RobinMalott](#)

Copyright © by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.

Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? [Send feedback](#)

